

Walter Armand Witschard  
William Bryan Woodson  
Harold James Wunsch  
Louis Harry Zakas

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be lieutenant colonel

Noyan, Patrick Theodore, O79658.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be major, Army Nurse Corps

Hill, Bernice Mary, N75.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 25, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*I Thessalonians 3: 12: The Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another and toward all men.*

Eternal God, in whose hands lie the destinies of all men, help us to feel our sacred unity as members of the human family and children of a common Father.

Make us alert and vigilant in finding ways of amity and concord for we penitently confess that our wills and desires so frequently clash in dissension and discord.

May the spirit of love and good will possess and control our hearts inspiring us to make every sacrifice that will bring blessedness to needy humanity and dispel the darkness which enshrouds the earth.

Hear our prayer through the merits and mediation of our blessed Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3800. An act to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 285. An act for the relief of John A. Skenandore;

S. 1321. An act to authorize the Attorney General to consent, on behalf of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, to a modification of the terms of a trust instrument executed by James B. Wilbur;

S. 2806. An act to revise the boundaries of the Coronado National Memorial and to authorize the repair and maintenance of an

access road thereto, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes;

S. 2932. An act to amend section 3568 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for reducing sentences of imprisonment imposed upon persons held in custody for want of bail while awaiting trial by the time so spent in custody; and

S. 3487. An act to amend the "Anti-Kick-back Statute" to extend it to all negotiated contracts.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 6871) entitled "An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, to authorize project grants for graduate training in public health, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HILL, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments to the bill (H.R. 5747) entitled "An act to amend section 152, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the concealment of assets in contemplation of bankruptcy."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4826) entitled "An act for the relief of Arthur E. Collins."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10455) entitled "An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11666) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2669) entitled "An act to extend the period of exemption from inspection under the provisions of section 4426 of the Revised Statutes granted certain small vessels carrying freight to and from places on the inland water of southeastern Alaska."

### ARTHUR E. COLLINS

Mr. LANE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4826) for the relief of Arthur E. Collins.

### AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11207) to amend the Small Business Act so as to authorize an additional \$150 million for loans to small businesses and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, RAINS, MULTER, McDONOUGH, WIDNALL, and BASS of New Hampshire.

### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11390) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2152)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11390) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 14, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 36, 38, 59, 79, and 83.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 37, 41, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, and 81, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$56,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$54,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$70,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$15,430,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$186,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$35,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,675,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$9,714,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$83,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$111,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$100,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$86,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$15,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$61,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$44,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$56,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with such project in excess of 15 per centum of the direct costs."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "205"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "206"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "207"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 5, 9, 16, 21, 23, 24, 40, 44, 46, 56, 64, 80, and 82.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,  
WINFIELD K. DENTON,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
MELVIN R. LAIRD,  
JOHN TABER,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

LISTER HILL,  
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
DENNIS CHAVEZ,  
JOHN STENNIS,  
JOHN O. PASTORE,  
MIKE MONRONEY,  
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,  
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,  
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11390) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

#### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### *Office of the Secretary*

Amendment No. 1—Salaries and expenses: Deletes language as proposed by the Senate. It was also agreed, in connection with a subsequent Senate amendment, that the same language would be made a part of Title IX—General Provisions.

Amendment No. 2—Working capital fund: Reported in disagreement.

*Labor-management reporting and disclosure activities*

Amendment No. 3—Salaries and expenses: Deletes language as proposed by the Senate.

It was also agreed, in connection with a subsequent Senate amendment, that the same language would be made a part of Title IX—General Provisions.

#### *Bureau of Labor Standards*

Amendment No. 4—Salaries and expenses: Deletes language as proposed by the Senate. It was also agreed, in connection with a subsequent Senate amendment, that the same language would be made a part of Title IX—General Provisions.

#### *Bureau of Employment Security*

Amendment No. 5—Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 6—Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: Appropriates \$325,819,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$320,819,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7—Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program: Appropriates \$1,404,100 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,344,100 as proposed by the House.

#### *Wage and Hour Division*

Amendment No. 8—Salaries and expenses: Deletes language as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agreed, in connection with a subsequent Senate amendment, to include similar language in Title IX—General Provisions.

#### TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

##### *Food and Drug Administration*

Amendment No. 9—Pharmacological-animal laboratory building: Reported in disagreement. It was agreed that a motion will be made for the House to recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment providing \$150,000 for plans and specifications for a special pharmacological-animal laboratory, and agree to the same with an amendment to reduce the appropriation to \$100,000. The conferees are in agreement that the original, tentative plans for this building, presented by the Food and Drug Administration, appear to be unnecessarily elaborate. It is the desire of the conferees that this building be adequate for the purpose but that it be so planned that any unnecessary construction expenses are avoided.

##### *Office of Education*

Amendment No. 10—Promotion and further development of vocational education: Deletes language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11—Grants for library services: Deletes language proposed by the House relating to allotment of funds and the period of availability of funds. A supplemental appropriation for 1960 in the approximate amount of \$1,369,000 will be necessary in order to carry out the Federal Government's obligation under the legislative action taken in connection with the 1960 and the 1961 appropriations for this activity.

Amendment No. 12—Payments to school districts: Appropriates an additional amount of \$7,362,000 for fiscal year 1959 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13—Defense educational activities: Appropriates \$173,050,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$171,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15—Defense educational activities: Delete language proposed by the Senate which would have changed the manner of making, and the amounts of allotments under Titles II and III of the Defense Education Act.

Amendment No. 16—Defense educational activities: Reported in disagreement.



*Office of Vocational Rehabilitation*

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18—Grants to States: Appropriates \$56,200,000 instead of \$54,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$57,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provides that \$54,700,000 of the appropriation is for vocational rehabilitation services under Section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act instead of \$53,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$56,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19—Grants to States: Provides that allotments to the States for the current fiscal year under Section 2 of the Act shall be made on the basis of \$70,000,000 instead of \$63,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$77,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that no deficiency in the appropriation shall result from this provision.

Amendment No. 20—Grants to States: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would amend the authorizing legislation with respect to grants to the State of Hawaii.

Amendment No. 21—Research and training: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 22—Research and training: Appropriates \$15,430,000 instead of \$14,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$630,000 over the amount proposed by the House will provide \$350,000 for new research and demonstration projects for an increased program for the rehabilitation of those who are more severely disabled, particularly those applying for OASI disability benefits; \$230,000 for approximately 50 new traineeships; and \$50,000 for approximately 11 additional research fellowships. The additional traineeships and fellowships are all in the fields of medicine and related speech and hearing.

*Public Health Service*

Amendment No. 23—Preamble: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24—Preamble: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25—Assistance to States, general: Deletes language proposed by the Senate, which would permit the use of \$1,000 for entertainment of officials of other countries.

Amendment No. 26—Assistance to States, general: Appropriates \$24,620,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$22,620,000 as proposed by the House. The increase proposed by the Senate represents approval of a budget amendment sent to the Senate by the President after the House had acted on the bill. The additional \$2,000,000 was proposed to be used for grants to States in order to stimulate and assist States and communities in initiating and expanding services designed to improve patient care and related services in nursing homes, which terms embrace nursing, medical, and other related health services provided by homes for the aged.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28—Control of tuberculosis: Appropriate \$6,430,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,930,000 as proposed by the House and provide that \$4,000,000 shall be available for grants to States as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29—Communicable disease activities: Appropriates \$14,116,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$13,516,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 30—Communicable disease activities: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to provide that \$5,700,000 of the appropriation shall be for the control of venereal diseases. This deletion was agreed to solely for the purpose of simplifying accounting. It will be expected that the amount indicated will be administratively

set aside for use in the program to control venereal diseases.

Amendment No. 31—Environmental health activities: Appropriates \$27,640,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$25,640,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 32 through 37—Grants for hospital construction: Appropriate \$186,200,000 instead of \$150,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$211,200,000 as proposed by the Senate and provide for the allocation of these funds as follows: \$150,000,000 for hospitals and related facilities pursuant to Part C as proposed by the Senate instead of \$118,800,000 as proposed by the House; \$35,000,000 for facilities pursuant to Part G instead of \$30,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$60,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; \$7,500,000 for diagnostic or treatment centers as proposed by the House instead of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; \$7,500,000 for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired as proposed by the House instead of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; \$10,000,000 for rehabilitation facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 38—Grants for hospital construction: Restores language relating to allotments proposed by the House and deleted by the Senate, and deletes language proposed by the Senate regarding the calculation of allotments to the State of Hawaii.

Amendment No. 39—Salaries and expenses, Hospital construction services: Appropriates \$1,675,000 instead of \$1,654,200 as proposed by the House and \$1,786,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40—Hospitals and medical care: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 41—Foreign quarantine activities: Appropriates \$4,931,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,812,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees are agreed that the increase of \$119,000 be used to augment the inspection services at those airports most seriously undermanned because of the increases in international travel.

Amendment No. 42—Construction of Indian health facilities: Appropriates \$9,714,000 instead of \$8,964,000 as proposed by the House and \$9,964,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$750,000 is for domestic and community sanitation facilities. The conferees are in agreement with the admonition contained in the House report that the Public Health Service carefully analyze all proposals for such facilities with a view to eliminating any projects where the cost is so high that more beneficial results could be obtained by a different application of funds.

Amendment No. 43—General research and services, National Institutes of Health: Appropriates \$83,900,000 instead of \$52,660,000 as proposed by the House and \$104,405,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44—General research and services, National Institutes of Health: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 45—National Cancer Institute: Appropriates \$111,000,000 instead of \$102,469,000 as proposed by the House and \$126,375,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount appropriated includes \$5,000,000 for grants for construction of cancer research facilities on a nonmatching basis.

Amendment No. 46—National Cancer Institute: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 47—Mental health activities: Appropriates \$100,900,000 instead of \$79,863,000 as proposed by the House and \$110,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48—National Heart Institute: Appropriates \$86,900,000 instead of \$71,762,000 as proposed by the House and \$125,166,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49—Dental health activities: Appropriates \$15,500,000 instead of \$12,604,000 as proposed by the House and \$16,710,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50—Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: Appropriates \$61,200,000 instead of \$52,841,000 as proposed by the House and \$70,760,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51—Allergy and infectious disease activities: Appropriates \$44,000,000 instead of \$38,439,000 as proposed by the House and \$48,234,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 52 and 53—Allergy and infectious disease activities: Provides that \$750,000 shall be available for payment to the Gorgas Memorial Institute as proposed by the Senate instead of \$150,000 as proposed by the House and that the funds shall be available for construction.

Amendment No. 54—Neurology and blindness activities: Appropriates \$56,600,000 instead of \$44,362,000 as proposed by the House and \$61,550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55—Grants for construction of health research facilities: Appropriates \$30,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56—Construction of mental health-neurology research facility: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 57—Buildings and facilities: Appropriates \$3,470,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,135,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 58—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$6,900,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,800,000 as proposed by the House.

*St. Elizabeths Hospital*

Amendment No. 59—Salaries and expenses: Deletes language proposed by the Senate relating to the rate of reimbursements to St. Elizabeths Hospital.

*Social Security Administration*

Amendment No. 60—Cooperative research or demonstration projects in social security: Appropriates \$350,000 instead of \$700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61—Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: Appropriates \$350,800 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$342,500 as proposed by the House.

*Gallaudet College*

Amendment No. 62—Construction: Appropriates \$2,512,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,432,000 as proposed by the House.

*Office of the Secretary*

Amendment No. 63—White House Conference on Aging: Appropriates \$760,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$550,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 64—Working capital fund: reported in disagreement.

*General Provisions*

Amendments Nos. 65 and 66: Delete language proposed by the House. The conferees agreed, in connection with subsequent amendments, to include the same language as a part of Title IX—General Provisions.

Amendments Nos. 67 and 68: Change section numbers.

Amendment No. 69: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate relating to the payment of indirect costs for research projects.

Amendments Nos. 70, 71, and 72: Change section numbers.

Amendment No. 73: Deletes language proposed by the House. The conferees agreed, in connection with a subsequent amendment, to include the same language in Title IX—General Provisions.

*TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD*

Amendment No. 74—Salaries and expenses: Deletes language proposed by the

House. The conferees agreed, in connection with a subsequent amendment, to include the same language in Title IX—General Provisions.

#### TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Amendment No. 75—Salaries and expenses: Deletes language proposed by the House. The conferees agreed, in connection with a subsequent amendment, to include the same language in Title IX—General Provisions.

Amendment No. 76—Salaries and expenses: Provides authority for the temporary employment of referees under Section 3 of the Railway Labor Act at rates not in excess of \$100 per diem as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$90 per diem as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 77—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$1,555,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,522,500 as proposed by the House.

#### TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Amendment No. 78—Limitation on salaries and expenses: Deletes language proposed by the House. The conferees agreed, in connection with a subsequent amendment, to include the same language in Title IX—General Provisions.

#### TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 79—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$3,905,400 as proposed by the House instead of \$4,093,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 80: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 81: Inserts language proposed by the Senate which will have the effect of consolidating in one place language which previously appeared at several different places in the bill.

Amendment No. 82: Reported in Disagreement.

Amendment No. 83: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to make appropriations available for rental of space in the District of Columbia.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,  
WINFIELD K. DENTON,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
MELVIN R. LAIRD,  
JOHN TABOR,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when this bill, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, was approved by the House of Representatives it carried a price tag of \$4,184 million. That was \$164 million above the budget figures and it was my opinion then that it was too rich.

Now the bill comes back to us today from the other body and we find it calls for the spending of \$4,354 million in this fiscal year or \$334 million above the budget figures.

This is budget busting with a vengeance.

It should be remembered, too, that this is the bill which provides funds for the National Defense Education Act under which fellowships are financed for studies such as comparative literature, the theater, home economics, animal ecology, the ecology and economics of flowing waters, political science, music, and folklore. What a study of the theater, music, folklore, and all the rest have to do with

national defense has never been explained.

This is the appropriation which also provides several thousand dollars for a study of dog discipline; a \$50,000 grant for a study of bird sounds; a \$30,000 study of the circulatory physiology of the octopus, and a \$33,000 grant to a foreign university for a study of both the intra-personal and interpersonal aspects of the role of relationship of husband and wife.

These are but a few of the inexplicable grants made under the appropriations to these departments and related agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I could not support this bill when it was before the House and exceeded the budget figures by \$164 million. It is unthinkable that it should come back to us from the other body and the conferees should ask us to support it with increases which bring it \$334 million above the budget recommendation.

I say again that this is budget busting at its worst and I want my vote recorded in opposition.

The conference report was agreed to. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: On page 2, line 17, insert the following:

#### "WORKING CAPITAL FUND

"The paragraph under this head in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 210) is amended to read as follows:

"Working capital fund: There is hereby established a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) a central visual exhibit service; (3) a central supply service for supplies and equipment for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet in whole or in part the requirements of the Department; (4) a central tabulating service; (5) telephone, mail and messenger services; (6) a central accounting and payroll service; and (7) a central laborers' service: *Provided*, That any stocks of supplies and equipment on hand or on order shall be used to capitalize such fund: *Provided further*, That such fund shall be reimbursed in advance from funds available to bureaus, offices, and agencies for which such centralized services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including reserves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, and on that motion I ask recognition to explain the conference report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thought we were to have an explanation of this bill before the conference report was voted on.

Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 193]

Alexander	Hollifield	Murray
Barden	Holt	Nix
Baumhart	Ikard	Norrell
Blitch	Kearns	Passman
Bolling	Kilburn	Patman
Bowles	King, Calif.	Powell
Celler	King, Utah	Preston
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Quie
Dixon	Landrum	Rains
Durham	Loser	Rogers, Mass.
Glenn	McDowell	Shelley
Goodell	McSweeney	Smith, Kans.
Grant	Magnuson	Taylor, N.Y.
Gray	Mahon	Thompson, La.
Healey	Mitchell	Vinson
Hébert	Moeller	Withrow
Hess	Morris, Okla.	
Hoffman, Ill.	Morrison	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet at the time the conference report was adopted, in order to give a brief explanation, but apparently did not make it clear that I desired recognition. I would, therefore, like to explain it at this time.

This is a unanimous conference report. Every member of the conference signed it. As is always the case, there were some members of the conference that felt that the appropriations were too high in some areas, and others felt they were too low, but we were all agreed that a good compromise resulted from the four sessions that we held.

The total of the bill as it passed the House was \$4,184,022,731. As it passed the Senate the total was \$4,485,788,931, or an increase over the House bill of \$301,766,200. The conference agreement totals \$4,354,357,931, or \$131,431,000 less than appropriated by the Senate bill.

There were 83 Senate amendments to the bill. Most of them involved rather small amounts. The large increase was in the Public Health Service. In the field of medical research alone the House bill provided \$455 million for the National Institutes of Health. The Senate bill increased this figure to \$664 million, or an increase over the House bill of \$209 million. So in this one field the increase accounts for over two-thirds of the total increase for the whole bill. The conference agreement was \$560 million, or a decrease of \$104 million below the Senate bill, and \$105 million over the bill as it passed the House. This represents approximately two-thirds of the total amount by which the entire bill is now over the amount passed by the House last March.

Another significant item in conference was for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton program. The House originally provided \$150 million for this program, and this was increased by the Senate to \$211,200,000, or an increase



of \$61,200,000. The conferees adopted the figure of \$186,200,000, which keeps the amount at the same level as for last year. This is an increase of \$36,200,000 over the House bill and \$25 million under the Senate bill. These two items, the National Institutes of Health and the hospital construction program, account for over 80 percent of the increase provided by the conference report over the bill as it originally passed the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How much was it over the budget?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is \$334,135,950 over the budget.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thought this bill was exceedingly rich when it left the House at \$4,184 million. Now it is \$164 million above the House figure, and \$334 million above the budget recommendation.

Mr. FOGARTY. As I tried to explain at that time, it was a compromise that we reached in the House last March. Some of us wanted to include more in the House bill than we did and others wanted to spend less, but we came out with a unanimous report on the agreement that was reached. Then the other body increased it by \$300 million. After four long sessions, we have finally made this compromise.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately prior to the vote on the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to our distinguished chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the following tabulation shows up-to-date comparison with the President's budget requests for the session on the appropriation bills. At the insistence of the other body, the 16 bills thus far cleared, including the excessive Labor-HEW total reported in this morning's RECORD, exceed the corresponding budget requests by \$301,807,547. Excessive nondefense appropriations pushed the total over the budget.

The two bills—public works and mutual security—on which conferences are being held today offer the last practicable opportunities to bring the total under the budget requests.

At a time when our gold reserves are continuing to dwindle, when the cost-of-living hits a new high nearly every 30 days, when the buying power of the dollar is less than half what it was only a few years back, when business profits on which the Treasury heavily depends to help pay the bills are slacking off—the situation demands that we stay within the budget.

# The tabulation follows:

Status of the appropriation bills for the 86th Cong., 2d sess., as of Aug. 25, 1960

	Bills compared with House	Bills compared with budget
Net total for the 16 session bills enacted.....		+\$301,807,547
Loan authorizations.....		(+211,400,000)
Pending:		
1. Public works, as passed by the Senate.....	+\$115,211,620	+25,869,425
2. Mutual security, as passed by the Senate.....	+309,304,000	-292,650,000
As the bills now stand (appropriations).....	-\$514,515,620	-266,780,575

NOTE.—Supplemental bill is yet to come.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on this bill or have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the committee with reference to the student loan fund. What disposition was made of that title?

Mr. FOGARTY. Last March, when the bill passed the House originally, we gave the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare everything that they asked for. They told us at that time that they would probably have to come back for a supplemental appropriation. That will be taken up on tomorrow in connection with the supplemental appropriation bill. It is not in this bill.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Then, do I understand correctly that there will be funds in the supplemental appropriation bill for the student loan fund?

Mr. FOGARTY. The bill is to be reported tomorrow and so I cannot answer the gentleman at this time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield at that point, as I understand the situation, if amendment No. 16 is adopted, they can spend anything they like. I did not understand that that was brought up with the idea that it was going to be agreed to.

Mr. FOGARTY. May I say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, that that is in another area and will be charged against next year's appropriation.

Mr. TABER. Yes; but it is not limited.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is the same as we are doing with reference to social security grants for public assistance and other similar programs. Then the advances are charged against the appropriation when it is made. This is what it says on page 20 of the bill "to be charged to the appropriation for the same purpose for that fiscal year."

That is the language of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Yes; but there is no limitation on what they can spend and

while it might be charged to an appropriation, obviously, they can go ahead and spend anything they like.

Mr. FOGARTY. The limitation is there since they cannot spend more than what the Congress appropriates. If they spend more in that first quarter than they should, then they are going to have to make up for it by cutting back the rest of the year.

Mr. TABER. It is a contract on the part of the Congress to provide the money and we cannot get out of it.

Mr. FOGARTY. We do this for the Social Security Administration and the Bureau of Employment Security in connection with their grant programs and we have not had any problems with reference to it.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. Is the intention made clear here that it is not a contract authority and that a contract could not be read into this?

Mr. FOGARTY. No.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Under this provision in amendment 16 they are authorized to take the money out of the Treasury, and there is no way to get it back after they receive it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Do I understand that the 15 percent overhead has been maintained in this conference report?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have had some serious reservations as to the advisability of expanding some of these programs as rapidly as we have. In talking with some of the administrators of schools in the administration of these research grants it seems to me we could well give consideration next year to increasing the indirect costs but not accelerating the actual grants as we have been in the past.

Mr. FOGARTY. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I think maybe something should be done, but perhaps in the other direction. A study has just been completed under a grant made by the National Institutes of Health that dealt with the question of overhead costs. I would like to read it, because there is a serious question raised by this grantee as to whether any overhead costs ought to be paid.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman knows probably better than I do that the determination of costs is not uniform, not the same for different departments of Government, not the same for the National Institutes of Health, for instance, as for the military. Different formulas are used. It seems to me desirable to have uniform treatment in this regard. Some administrators of schools have serious reservations as to the adequacy of 15 percent.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss in a little more detail the action taken with respect to the appropriations

agreed to for the National Institutes of Health.

#### THE BASIS FOR AGREEMENT

First, I should like to emphasize that I believe there is almost complete agreement between the House and the Senate concerning the basic philosophy under which the Federal Government should act in respect to medical research. This was reflected in the attitude of the conferees from both Houses in their discussions of the items that were in disagreement in this bill.

Their attitudes reflected complete agreement upon the significance of medical research, upon the objectives to be sought, and in general upon the approaches which should be followed in attaining such objectives.

The basic problems which the conferees faced were to find a financial plan consistent with these agreed-upon basic principles and that was also realistic in terms of operational requirements.

I should like, as I did last year, to report to the House the gratification I experienced in participating with the immediate members of the Senate and my distinguished colleagues in the House in the conference discussions concerning these medical research appropriations. There was, as always, a forthright exchange of views which, as I have said, did not differ in respect to basic principles but only in honest attempts to determine the optimum level of support of these programs in order to achieve the most effective results.

The conferees have agreed to accept a figure of \$560 million as the total for the several appropriations of the National Institutes of Health in fiscal year 1961. This amount is \$104 million under the amount in the Senate version of this bill and \$105 million above the allowance originally made by the House in its passage of this bill. It is, however, \$160 million greater than the amount which the President had requested for these appropriations in his budget last January.

#### MEDICAL RESEARCH AND THE NATIONAL BUDGET

To those who are concerned about this increase I should like to say this: The President's budget proposals for fiscal year 1961 in the field of medical research in essence set forth the point of view that the development of medical research in the United States should not be accelerated. This view, I am afraid, was based wholly upon fiscal considerations.

The Congress this year, as it has in past years, has again emphasized that maintaining the existing level of our national medical research effort is a completely unwise, if not disastrous, course of action to follow.

We cannot stand still in our search for knowledge. We cannot mark time or restrain research because of contrived fiscal reasons or for misleading arguments that research is inflationary or that there are economic obstacles which stand in the way. This attitude, I believe, reflects an utter and complete misunderstanding of the meaning that medical research has for the Nation.

It is my view, and I believe the view of this Congress, that a strong and sustained and increasing medical research

effort is sound national economics. The effect of medical research is not inflationary, nor does it threaten progress in other areas of our national economy.

The ultimate product of medical research is an enlargement of the wealth of this Nation. This wealth comes from the increased national productivity which derives from a well population, from reducing the loss in energy and creativity resulting from disease, and the longer effective lifespan of our people.

This Nation now spends over \$21 billion for doctors bills, for the operation of hospitals, for the purchase of drugs and medicines, and other forms of medical care and health services. This vast national expenditure is a burden which can be substantially modified if we can move forward with our medical research programs.

#### BETTER HEALTH AND GREATER PRODUCTIVITY

Medical research can change in a radical and revolutionary manner the whole pattern of medical care, hospital services, and health practices. The achievements and the progress that is possible as a result of research findings can drastically reorder the nature of health manpower requirements and the whole pattern of medical, hospital, and health services and expenditures of the Nation.

This is not only possible, but it has happened, and happened numerous times. Outstanding instances of the revolutionary consequences of the findings of medical research are the following:

First. The whole character of the treatment of infectious disease has changed, the great threats that the pneumonias and other dangerous infections posed in the past have been almost completely dispelled by the emergence of the antibiotics. This is the result of research efforts. On the other hand, the common cold still costs the Nation as much as \$2 billion a year in industrial absenteeism.

Second. We have witnessed in the past few years the diminishment of tuberculosis as a major cause of death and illness in this country as a result of the development of new drugs effective in the care of this dreaded disease. The whole structure of hospitalization in the Nation has changed as a result. Large numbers of tuberculosis hospitals throughout the country have closed or been converted to other uses and all the health manpower, nurses, technicians, and physicians, once demanded for the treatment of tuberculosis, have now directed their skills and energies to other urgent health and medical care problems. On the other hand, recent increases in the attack rate of cancer of the lung places this condition foremost in the causes of death from lung involvements.

Third. We are witnessing today a basic change in the approach to the treatment of mental illness as a result of the remarkable discovery made concerning the relationship of drugs and psychological and psychiatric conditions. For the first time we have seen the total population of our mental institutions decrease and we are looking forward, as a result of the intensified efforts in this area engendered by the actions of

the Congress of the United States, to new and heartening prospects in the solution of the problems of mental illness. This, again, is an achievement of medical research that is reshaping the entire character of our community health efforts and recovering for the Nation the vast creative potential of these once ill minds. Nonetheless, the mentally ill still occupy one out of two hospital beds throughout the country, and in the aggregate this group of illnesses cause the taxpayer the loss of approximately \$2.5 billion.

On the basis of these few isolated but dramatic instances of the influence and effect of medical research on the one hand and of the problems yet to be solved on the other, it is possible to see that the continued movement forward in medical research holds the promise of completely transforming the balance of national expenditures and productivity in the future. The concept that we must maintain the line on expenditures for medical research, is the same as saying that we must stop now, not pursue the promising leads that have opened in respect to the viral origin of cancer, nor seek virus vaccines to control the common cold, we must not expand our effort to understand the biochemical basis of schizophrenia, we must stop now our promising inquiry into the nature of heart disease. That we must mark time, hold opportunities that now beckon in abeyance and direct our attention to a budget balance sheet. To do all this is to deny the strength and promise of our scientific capability.

It is not the role of medical research to wait. The promise of the future is too bright and too great.

Medical research is a revolutionary force. It can change in a radical manner the level of national productivity, the life expectancy of our people, and our prospect of well-being.

This progressive decrease in the ravages of disease, the tragedy of premature death, and the progressive increase in the productivity of our people and our Nation is to me an objective without parallel when we consider what our national purpose should be.

It is toward this end which we are moving in the level of appropriations which I present here to you today as a result of the House and Senate conference on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill.

A budget of over a half a billion dollars for the National Institutes of Health is a complicated matter. It cannot be intelligently considered except through a detailed consideration of its various parts. The following table will in summary indicate the nature of the conference agreement.

I should like to emphasize that the specific amounts set forth in this table for the individual program elements comprising the several appropriations are not intended to be fixed or absolute levels of expenditure for the individual items. When changing operating circumstances require, I believe it important to leave it up to the good judgment of the program operators to make such adjustments in these amounts as is necessary in the interest of effective progress and prudent utilization of resources.



	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance	Senate increases	Conference agreement
Grants for research and training:					
1. Research projects at 15 percent indirect costs.....	\$205,589,000	\$235,189,000	\$262,389,000	+\$27,200,000	\$260,000,000
(a) Increase required to pay 25 percent indirect costs.....	0	0	22,681,000	+22,681,000	
2. Research fellowships.....	14,570,000	15,070,000	22,500,000	+7,430,000	20,000,000
(a) 1960 unpaid, approved applications.....	(5,444,948)				
3. Training grants.....	66,894,000	78,894,000	128,991,000	+50,097,000	110,000,000
(b) Increase provided for forward notification on graduate training grants.....	0	(9,565,000)	(16,445,000)	(-6,880,000)	(16,445,000)
State control programs.....	10,375,000	12,975,000	13,475,000	+500,000	13,000,000
Community demonstration projects.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,625,000	+125,000	1,500,000
Clinical research centers.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	55,000,000	+52,000,000	20,000,000
Primate centers.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	12,000,000	+10,000,000	7,000,000
Construction of cancer research facilities.....	0	5,000,000	0	-5,000,000	5,000,000
Cancer and mental-neurology buildings construction.....	0	0	12,839,000	+12,839,000	12,839,000
Total, extramural programs.....	303,928,000	353,628,000	531,500,000	+177,572,000	449,339,000
Direct operations:					
1. Chemotherapy contracts.....	21,145,000	21,145,000	23,140,000	+1,995,000	21,500,000
2. Other direct operations.....	74,927,000	80,227,000	83,860,000	+3,633,000	82,161,000
Total, intramural programs.....	96,072,000	101,372,000	107,000,000	+5,628,000	103,661,000
New areas:					
1. Medical libraries.....	0	0	5,000,000	+5,000,000	0
2. Communications research and translation.....	0	0	4,500,000	+4,500,000	0
3. Instrumentation research.....	0	0	5,000,000	+5,000,000	0
4. Career development.....	0	0	4,000,000	+4,000,000	2,000,000
5. International medical research.....	0	0	7,000,000	+7,000,000	5,000,000
Total, new areas.....	0	0	25,500,000	+25,500,000	7,000,000
Grand total.....	400,000,000	455,000,000	664,000,000	+209,000,000	560,000,000

I should like to explain for the information of the House, the basis of the conference action in each of the major NIH functional areas and relate the amounts proposed for these areas to the levels contained in the appropriation bill passed by the House earlier in the year.

#### RESEARCH PROJECTS

A total of \$260 million is provided to be utilized for the making of grants in support of medical research projects carried out in the universities, medical schools, and research institutions in the country. This amount will provide the funds necessary to continue the research programs which are now under way supported by NIH grants in these institutions and in addition permit the awarding of grants for most new applications received during fiscal year 1961 which withstand the rigorous scientific review carried out by the NIH review bodies and which are recommended for payment as being important to the solution of major disease problems by these several national advisory committees of the NIH.

This total increase in funds for research grants should be viewed in terms of the important areas of research inquiry which will benefit. A very few of these areas selected as examples of both past progress and present opportunity would include viruses and the cause of cancer, radiation and the treatment of cancer, drugs and the mentally ill, surgery and heart disease, dental caries and infectious agents, causation of arthritis and drugs for treatment, arteriosclerosis and strokes, and a whole host of such practical problem areas as mental retardation, drug addiction, alcoholism, to say nothing of the pressing medical problems of our elder citizens.

#### FELLOWSHIPS

A total of \$22 million is provided for the support of research fellowships in fiscal year 1961. This program of research fellowships is an essential activity directed toward the development of the supply of senior teachers and research investigators which will be

needed to staff the medical schools and research laboratories of the future. This allowance will permit the payment of substantially all the backlog of unpaid-approved fellowship applications now in hand and extending the senior fellowship awards to include the clinical areas. It will also permit providing broader support for medical students and enlarging the foreign fellowship program. This amount also includes \$2 million for the awarding of approximately 100 research fellowships as a means of establishing research professorships to enlarge opportunities for stable careers in academic medicine and research.

#### TRAINING GRANTS

An amount of \$110 million is provided for the support of training grants to support training in the sciences and disciplines basic to medicine and medical research where shortages continue to exist in terms of current needs and to provide for enlargement of the trained research manpower of the future. Included in this amount is sufficient funds, estimated at \$16.4 million, to permit reordering the payment periods for training grants which will allow such grants to be made on a forward payment basis—an arrangement necessary to permit proper planning and effective conduct of these programs.

Important areas of manpower development which will be benefited by this increase in training grant funds include:

Investigators in the sciences fundamental to clinical medicine.

Experimental approaches to providing greater research and scientific content to the training of physicians.

Research pharmacologists in the field of mental disorders.

A wide range of specialized manpower contributory to cardiovascular research.

Virologists, immunologists, and immunochemists whose work is basic in the fields of infectious diseases and allergies, and now of crucial importance to virus-cancer investigations.

Investigators able to pursue genetic phenomena at the molecular level.

Biophysicists and biochemists who can pursue the basic phenomena of chemical and energy transformations at the cellular level.

Research neurophysiologists and neuroanatomists essential to the research attack upon the disorders of vision and cerebrovascular diseases.

#### CLINICAL RESEARCH CENTERS

A major feature of the conference agreement is the provision of funds for several special programs which had been included in the Senate-passed version of the appropriation bill and had their origins in the extensive recommendations made by the Jones committee. Most important amongst these special programs is the designation of \$20 million for the further development and support of a program for the establishment of large-scale clinical research centers throughout the country. This program has its origins in the efforts made by the National Institutes of Health to provide support for a series of clinical and metabolic research facilities undertaken in fiscal year 1960.

During this past year some eight grants, totaling approximately \$3 million, were made to eight medical institutions in the country. These grants provided funds for the establishment of specially designed clinical and metabolic research facilities, staffed and equipped to meet the growing needs of programs involving research investigations in the clinical area. This program has met with enthusiastic support and approval in the research community of the Nation. The Jones committee report called for an enlargement of this program to permit the establishment of broadly based clinical research centers. It is intended that these centers will provide a stable framework in which a variety of medical and scientific disciplines can be organized for a concentrated attack upon major disease or health problems. All laboratory and clinical facilities and supporting services necessary for the research program to be carried out would be encompassed within such centers.

The Senate-passed version of the bill provided \$55 million for these research centers. The conferees have agreed that a level of \$20 million is perhaps a more realistic and feasible level to initiate what undoubtedly will be a substantial program of great importance to the further development of medical research in the Nation.

#### PRIMATE RESEARCH CENTERS

A total of \$7 million is provided for the further development of centers for research utilizing subhuman primates. This program was begun in fiscal year 1960 when \$2 million was made available. These funds were granted for the establishment of a large primate center near Portland, Oreg. This center will make available several species of primates in adequate numbers and with appropriate facilities to meet the needs of scientists engaged in research requiring the use of primates. Although the Senate proposed a level of \$12 million in fiscal year 1961 for this purpose, the conferees agreed that \$7 million, a reduction of \$5 million from the Senate allowance, but an increase of \$5 million over the House allowance, would be an adequate amount to satisfy the more urgent needs in this area during fiscal year 1961. On the basis of experience gained in this more modest initial effort, it will be possible to develop an appropriate goal in this important program area.

#### INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH

The conferees also agreed that special emphasis in fiscal year 1961 should be given to the further extension of NIH research programs through support of investigators in foreign countries working in fields important to the program objectives of the several institutes. The Senate allowance for this purpose totaled \$7 million. The conferees agreed that \$5 million was a more appropriate amount for this purpose. In the conferees' view this amount should be utilized in addition to current funds now being utilized for research support of foreign investigators.

#### CONSTRUCTION

A total of \$12,839,000 is provided for two important building projects at the National Institutes of Health; \$12,139,000 of this amount will be for the planning and construction of a joint mental health-neurology basic science laboratory building; \$700,000 is intended to be utilized for the planning of a new building to house cancer research activities at NIH. These projects will provide the means to deal with the increasingly difficult problems of space shortage which are hampering the progress of research activities at the Bethesda installation of NIH.

A special item of \$5 million has been provided in the cancer appropriation to be utilized for taking care of a special need in the development of cancer research facilities which require non-matching funds.

The conferees agreed to allow the full authorized maximum of \$30 million to be used for matching grants for research facilities construction under the health research facilities construction program.

This amount was previously allowed in both the Senate- and House-passed versions of the bill, but is an increase of \$5 million over the President's budget request.

I have attempted in the foregoing to single out the major elements of increase in this overimportant series of appropriations. Both the Senate and House reports contain observations concerning the views of Congress on the direction and emphasis which should be given in the development and conduct of these national research programs. The National Institutes of Health is expected to pay careful attention to these observations in the planning and development of its programs during the forthcoming year.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and all the members of the subcommittee, for the very fine bill they have brought in. One item particularly is of vital importance to the people of Chicago, namely, the appropriation of \$500,000 to undertake a study of water pollution in the Great Lakes and the Illinois Waterway. The total cost of this survey as estimated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is \$12 million. The fund approved by this bill permits a significant start on that survey.

I stated that this appropriation is of vital importance to the people of the city of Chicago, but that is an inadequate understatement. Actually, this is a national bill. It is of vital importance to the people living on the Great Lakes because it seeks to protect that vital water resource for the enjoyment of those living today, and for future generations to come. It is of importance to all the people of our Nation, not only in the preservation of the waters of the Great Lakes but because of the essential scientific information the study will elicit. For decades literally, a harassing, vituperative verbal and legal battle has been fought between the States bordering on the Great Lakes and the people of Chicago. Chicago needs the waters of Lake Michigan to live. Chicago needs such waters to dispose of its sewage and waste so that its people may continue to grow and prosper.

Years ago, when the city's pollution was discharged into the lake, it contaminated the drinking water and epidemics of typhoid ravaged Chicago's population. It was only when the flow of the Chicago River was reversed and a portion of Lake Michigan's waters were diverted to move the waste along the Illinois Waterway, that Chicago's health problem was solved.

Water is a precious resource and the opposition of our sister States to our withdrawal of water can be understood if not appreciated. They have flung recriminations against the people of Chicago charging that we are stealing water

from the Great Lakes, which is untrue. The water has not been stolen. It has been withdrawn pursuant to authority granted by the Federal Government. The fact remains that the disputants have been at loggerheads. The effort has been made to withdraw an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water from Lake Michigan as an experiment for 1 year to determine whether such withdrawal would have any harmful effects upon Chicago's sister communities on the Great Lakes. Objection to the proposal has been violent, not only in the debates in the Halls of Congress, but in the courts in a suit filed by a number of the States in the Supreme Court of the United States to require Chicago to return its sewage into the Great Lakes.

This appropriation approving the study brings the olive branch of peace to the dispute. For the first time the parties will be able to obtain tangible facts where speculation and estimates existed before. For the first time actual measurements can be taken of the effect of the diversion on lake levels and upon harbor, shipping, and power facilities. For the first time, a scientific study will be made of lake currents and drifts to ascertain the situation in the lower end of Lake Michigan to determine whether sewage may be safely returned therein or whether the method now used by the city in washing it along the Illinois Waterway is not only the preferable method but the only feasible method.

The time for accusations, for invective, for playing politics with the diversion issue is over. This is the time for cooperation and working together, for purposeful mature effort to obtain the basic information which will permit everyone to know what to do and to take the steps necessary to preserve this vital water resource and the health of our communities.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 6, line 2, insert "including conveyance by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to the United States of title to the land on which such building is to be situated."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 14, line 14 insert:

"PHARMACOLOGICAL-ANIMAL LABORATORY BUILDING

"For plans and specifications for a special pharmacological-animal laboratory for the Food and Drug Administration, \$150,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.



The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein, with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named therein, insert "\$100,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 19, line 25, insert "Grants, loans, and payments under the National Defense Education Act, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, loans, and payments under all titles of the National Defense Education Act, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the appropriation for the same purpose for that fiscal year."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 and concur therein.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides, as follows:

Grants, loans, and payments under the National Defense Education Act, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, loans, and payments under all titles of the National Defense Education Act, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the appropriation for the same purpose for that fiscal year.

Under this amendment No. 16 there is carte blanche authority given to the agency to do what it pleases and incur any liability it might want to and take the money out of the Treasury. Frankly, so far as I am concerned, I am not prepared to let any agency have that authority, therefore I hope the House will refuse to approve this motion.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, this language is exactly the same as that carried in the bill in previous years for grants made by the Bureau of Employment Security, and we have also done it for social security programs. If we do not do this it will be impossible for the program to operate in these colleges where the students are asking for loans if the appropriation bill is late next year.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. If we are going to do things this way and allow them to take the money right out of the Treasury, there is no restraint whatever.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This would permit them under the National Defense Education Act to grant funds for the study of the

theater, music, jazz, and the policy and economics of flowing water, and all that sort of thing, is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. This bill does not govern that at all. The basic legislation governs that.

Mr. GROSS. They have made grants for fellowships for the study of those things.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the gentleman did a very good job when the bill was on the floor in bringing to light some of these problems. I assume they have corrected any weaknesses because of the gentleman's interest in the program.

Mr. GROSS. Under the language of this amendment they can go even further.

Mr. FOGARTY. This would allow the students to get these loans even if the annual appropriation bill is late in being passed and thus enable the administrators and the schools and colleges operating under the program to carry out a better program.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would like to inquire if the adoption of this amendment will make available sufficient funds for the applications of these students for loans?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. That will be taken up tomorrow in connection with a deficiency appropriation bill. There is a request pending before that committee to increase funds for student loans. That will be taken up at that time. This pertains to the first quarter of the next fiscal year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. From what the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said, as I understand it under this bill this group could go direct to the Treasury and get their money. I assume that the House has something to do with appropriations. I understood the gentleman to say earlier that the Senate increased the bill we sent over by something like \$500 million, is that right?

Mr. FOGARTY. It was not quite that much.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How much?

Mr. FOGARTY. The Senate increased the bill by a little over \$300 million.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Three hundred million dollars. I thought they had in their bill \$500 million and you cut it down or your committee cut it down to \$300 million.

Mr. FOGARTY. I mentioned a figure of \$664 million for the National Institutes of Health. We cut that figure by \$104 million.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My information is that over the years every bill we sent over there they up it; is that not right?

Mr. FOGARTY. We think we did a pretty good job in reaching the compromise we did this year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In reality we do not have too much to say about how much is appropriated.

Mr. FOGARTY. We do by our votes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know of the other body ever cutting this particular appropriation bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. Not this one. This affects every section of our society. It affects human beings. It is a popular field. The people are vitally affected and so are interested in these programs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman agree that it also affects the taxpayers of the country?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. And I am sure the taxpayers are willing to pay for this kind of a program, because in the end it is going to save them money.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I call for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Well, it appears to the Chair that the gentleman's request comes rather late. The Chair has already declared the motion agreed to and ordered the Clerk to report the next amendment in disagreement.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 194]

Alexander	Healey	Murray
Alger	Hébert	Nix
Ayres	Hess	Norrell
Barden	Hoffman, III.	Passman
Baumhart	Ikard	Powell
Blitch	Jones, Ala.	Preston
Boggs	Kearns	Quile
Bolling	Kilburn	Reece, Tenn.
Bowles	King, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Boykin	King, Utah	Shelley
Buckley	Landrum	Sisk
Cahill	Loser	Smith, Kans.
Celler	McDowell	Taylor, N.Y.
Cooley	McSweeney	Teague, Tex.
Curtis, Mass.	Magnuson	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	Mahon	Vinson
Durham	Metcalf	Widnall
Glenn	Mitchell	Withrow
Goodell	Moeller	
Grant	Morrison	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

# DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement. The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 22, line 18, strike out "for research, training, and traineeships, and other special project grants, pursuant to section 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, for", and insert "for grants and other expenses for research, training, traineeships, and other special projects, pursuant to section 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, for expenses of."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "For grants and other expenses (including not to exceed \$150,000, in addition to funds provided elsewhere, for administrative expenses) for research, training, traineeships, and other special projects, pursuant to section 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, for expenses of."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 24, line 4, insert "expenses incident to the dissemination of health information in foreign countries through exhibits and other appropriate means."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 24, line 20, insert "Provided, That section 208(g) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is amended by striking out 'eighty-five', and inserting in lieu thereof 'one hundred and fifty', and by striking out 'seventy-three' and inserting in lieu thereof 'one hundred and fifteen'";

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 30, line 5, insert "Provided further, That this appropriation shall be available for medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization of retired ships' officers and members of crews of Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels, and their dependents, and for payment therefor."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 32, line 2, insert "not to exceed \$2,500 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General";

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 46: Page 32, line 23, insert "of which \$700,000, to remain available until December 31, 1961, shall be available for plans and specifications for a research facility for the National Cancer Institute."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 34, line 13, insert:

## "CONSTRUCTION OF MENTAL HEALTH-NEUROLOGY RESEARCH FACILITY"

"For construction of a combined basic and collaborative research facility for the National Institutes of Mental Health and Neurological Diseases and Blindness, including a physical biology component, and including plans and specifications, fixed and semifixed equipment, access roads and parking facilities, extension of existing power, refrigeration and other utility systems, \$12,139,000, to be derived by transfer from 'Mental health activities' and 'Neurology and blindness activities', as determined by the Surgeon General."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 45, line 16, insert:

## "WORKING CAPITAL FUND"

"The paragraph under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 369) is amended to read as follows:

"Working capital fund: There is hereby established a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction serv-

ice; (2) a central visual exhibit service; (3) a central supply service for supplies and equipment for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet in whole or in part the requirements of the Department; (4) a central tabulating service; (5) telephone, mail, and messenger services; (6) a central accounting and payroll service; and (7) a central laborers' service: *Provided*, That any stocks of supplies and equipment on hand or on order shall be used to capitalize such fund: *Provided further*, That such fund shall be reimbursed in advance from funds available to bureaus, offices, and agencies for which such centralized services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including reserves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 80: Page 52, line 15, insert:

"Sec. 903. Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in advance for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public and for payment in advance for publications available only upon that basis or available at a reduced price on prepublication orders."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 82: Page 53, line 3, insert:

"Sec. 905. Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include extraneous matter in my remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?



There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the members of the House conferees and the members of the House Committee on Appropriations, and particularly the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], on agreeing to the Senate amendment in adding funds for schools in impacted areas. Unfortunately, there has been a perennial problem concerning Public Laws 815 and 874, in explaining to the membership that this is not Federal aid to education or a Federal handout as such, but is simply a program by which the Federal Government can meet a portion of its obligations to the various communities in which its agencies are located. Obviously, when the Federal Government becomes a principal industry in a community and does not pay taxes for the land it owns as other industries must do, there is a deficiency in the economy of that community to render the services that must be provided as a result of the existence of the industry in the area. One of the most vital services which must be provided is an adequate public school system.

Yet, as I stated above, in spite of the simplicity of this obligation, it seems necessary to explain the problem over and over again. Fortunately, the Congress has repeatedly recognized this responsibility and has continually granted the appropriations pursuant to the act as well as renewed and extended the act on previous occasions.

The problem that exists here today is the fact that even though we recognize the responsibility from time to time, we fail to appropriate the full amount which is authorized and the amount to which the communities would be entitled under the formula agreed upon. This makes it extremely difficult for the communities involved to formulate a sound budget or financial program. It is, therefore, imperative for the Congress to state what it intends to do and fulfill its promises in a way in which the communities can count on these funds. The action taken by the conferees to eliminate the current deficiency, I am certain, will help many communities involved in overcoming a serious problem of meeting a deficiency in the school budget for this current year.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on H.R. 11390, which makes appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

I am glad to note that the higher Senate figure of \$173,050,000 was agreed to for grants, loans, and payments under the National Defense Education Act of 1958; that the expansion of teaching in education of the mentally retarded

grant of \$1 million to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning and the State educational agencies, pursuant to the act of September 6, 1958, was not disturbed.

I am pleased with the increase of grants to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to \$57,500,000. The substantial increase in favor of grants for hospital construction to \$186,200,000 will materially help grants and loans for hospitals and related facilities, including diagnostic and treatment centers and hospitals for the chronically ill and injured.

I am glad to see substantial increases in the appropriations for research in cancer, heart, arthritis, mental health, and other conditions which are affecting our population and which will be eliminated or reduced by continued study.

#### AMENDING FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 624, Rept. No. 2156), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 12677) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of interstate retail enterprises, to increase the minimum wage under the Act to \$1.15 an hour, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and they are hereby disagreed to and that the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses be, and the same is hereby, agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 624 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 30 of this year this body passed H.R. 12677, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended. The vote was 341 to 72. I voted in the negative.

I voted against the bill for many reasons, the chief reason because I am opposed to the Federal Government regulating wages whether the regulation be minimum or maximum wages.

The bill as passed the House is a moderate one as compared to the bill that passed the other body. Even the bill that passed the other body is mild as compared to the decision of some in this field.

The Senate bill would establish the minimum for workers presently covered at \$1 with three annual raises, to \$1.15 next January; on January 1, 1962 to \$1.20, and to \$1.25 on January 1, 1963. It would add 4 million workers. Exemptions were for hotels, motels, restaurants, and sales agencies. I believe I am safe in saying that if a wage-hour bill passed this Congress that there will be a strong effort to include hotels, motels, restaurants, laundries, automobile

and farm implement dealers the next session of Congress. I also predict that should this bill pass that there will be many bankruptcies in the businesses affected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 624?

The question was taken, and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the House agreed to consider House Resolution 624.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BARDEN, LANDRUM, ROOSEVELT, DENT, KEARNS, AYRES, and Hiestand.

#### REVISING THE BOUNDARIES OF DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT AND PROVIDING AN ENTRANCE ROAD OR ROADS THERETO

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 6597) to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for District of Columbia bills to be considered tomorrow. I shall put a list of bills in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, the majority leader spoke to me about calling these bills up. I have talked to our people on the committee, and they are in agreement that the bills might as well be considered tomorrow as on a later District day.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may we know what the bills are?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Does the gentleman want me to list them now?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot say that they will be called up in this order, but they are:

S. 2131, a motor vehicle records act. That is on responsibility, a responsibility bill.

H.R. 13053, an increase in pay for police and firemen.

H.R. 12993, a pay increase for teachers.

H.R. 12775, retirement compensation for police and firemen widows and orphans.

S. 3727, home improvement companies, a bill relating to the bonding of the same.

S. 2306, National Women's Party, Inc., exempting certain property from taxation.

S. 3415, a bill relating to exempting certain property from taxation of the American Association of University Women, Educational Foundation, Inc.

H.R. 11535, amending the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to permit the sale of alcoholic beverages on New Year's Day when New Year's Day falls on Sunday.

S. 3416, a bill to provide for the restoration to the United States of amounts expended in the District of Columbia in carrying out provisions of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958.

S. 1870, a bill to provide for the licensing of practical nurses in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11370, a bill amending the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

H.R. 10921, to regulate life insurance investments. That is on the acceptance of Senate amendments.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman say that these bills will come up tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. They will be on the list tomorrow. Of course, next Monday is another day, but we could utilize tomorrow and get rid of as many as possible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### ELECTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Elections Subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### PROJECT GRANTS FOR GRADUATE TRAINING IN PUBLIC HEALTH

Mr. ROBERTS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 6871), to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, to authorize project grants for graduate training in public health, and for other purposes.

#### FREEDOM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, because of the limited calendar at our disposal in this session, I hesitated to ask for this time but felt the subject for discussion warranted the special order.

My purpose today is to speak of freedom. And I am sure that every Member of this body will be in ready agreement that there is no more important subject with which we can concern ourselves.

It is in no wise to minimize the patriotism of my countrymen to suggest that sometimes, in these days, we are inclined to take freedom for granted.

It is like the air we breathe; we expect it as a right, and accept it casually. Because freedom for Americans is an accepted thing, we are oftentimes disposed to assume that this is a commonplace condition throughout the world.

As a matter of fact, while we are gathered here, and at the very time I am speaking, millions upon millions of human beings are totally denied freedom, are in fact existing under the stern repressions and deprivations of Communist tyranny.

And so I address myself today to the all-important subject of freedom—freedom as a God-given right to be enjoyed by all men in all climes and in all the remote parts of the world.

Americans cannot be indifferent—nor are we—to the plight of our fellow human beings behind the Iron and the Bamboo Curtains. These slaves of Red tyranny are our brothers; their distress is our concern; their welfare our duty.

One has only to consult the pages of American history to quickly come upon the fact that the colonial forces in our Nation's war for freedom and independence were brilliantly served by patriots from the Old World. Gen. George Washington and his men were admirably assisted by such soldiers as Baron von Steuben of Germany, Kosciuszko and Pulaski of Poland, and valiant warriors from Hungary and elsewhere. These men risked their all that America might have independence. And so it is now only a matter of conscience and sound national policy, a matter of retributive justice that we now interest ourselves in our separated brethren who languish in the vast prisons of Iron Curtain land.

Mr. Speaker, in the beginning I would like to stress one simple fact: freedom is indivisible. To paraphrase Lincoln, the world cannot endure "half slave and half free," and further to remark upon the like thought of the Great Emancipator, just so long as the freedom of any one people is denied, then so is the freedom of the whole world in jeopardy.

Another fact I would like to point up at the outset is that nowhere on the face of the earth is there a Communist government that has resulted from a free choice by free men. Communist governments today are the result of bloody force, or the connivings of Red puppets who undermined the states by subversion and treason. The Red empire today rules by force—let the Red armies be withdrawn from the satellite countries and see how long the Communists would remain in power.

As we look out upon the world at this very minute, we see a real imperialist empire, a vast colonial enterprise, imposing its will on millions of people in many countries.

So we come to the all-important question of the captive nations—nations and peoples held in the vicious vise of Red tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, last year the Congress of the United States passed one of the most

significant pieces of legislation in our time. That was the Captive Nations Week resolution, now Public Law 86-90. This year, Americans responded enthusiastically to the summons of this resolution and also to the Presidential proclamation which is based upon it. The first anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution was a huge success. The record of this year's Captive Nations Week observances must be taken account of, and the pressing need for the implementation of Public Law 86-90 must be needed. The citizens of our Nation have expressed themselves on this need, and we, their representatives, are obliged to fulfill it.

In proposing a House Committee on the Captive Nations I wish to describe in the most succinct manner possible the record of essential events surrounding the resolution and this year's observances. Allow me to approach this vital subject by, first, stating the meaning and significance of Captive Nations Week; second, presenting the preparations made by our citizens for this year's successful observance; third, showing the scope and extent of the observance; and, fourth, offering additional evidence for immediate congressional action in establishing a House Committee on the Captive Nations.

#### KHRUSHCHEV AND CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

In view of world developments this past year, and particularly in recent months, the urgency of recognizing the strategic importance of all the captive nations to U.S. interests in the cold war cannot be too strongly emphasized. Khrushchev himself provided conclusive evidence of this. It will be recalled that when Congress passed the resolution last year and the President issued the proclamation, Khrushchev flew into a wild rage. There was good, sound reason for this violent and troubled reaction. The resolution for the first time struck at the tenuous bases of Moscow's propaganda pretensions and claims by which it seeks to deceive and influence minds throughout the nontotalitarian free world.

Month after month, Moscow and its organs continued the attack against the resolution and the enormous possibilities implied by it. Why should this so-called mighty power have been troubled so deeply? The reason lies in the critical threat posed by the contents of the resolution to Moscow's ideologic war against the free world. Realism in foreign policy necessitates that we be guided by evidence. This evidence of the past year cannot be ignored.

Unfortunately, the meaning of the resolution and Moscow's reaction to it was not fully understood or appreciated by many Americans. Some chided the Congress for confronting the sprawling Bear with the clubs of truth and ideals. Others failed completely in their understanding of the new qualities and dimensions of the resolution. They never bothered to ask themselves, "How is it, our leaders spoke in the past about captive nations and yet Moscow didn't react this way?" The reason for this was due to the fact that for the first time the resolution spoke in behalf of all captive



nations, particularly those within the Soviet Union. In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I should like to incorporate with my remarks a transcript of the program, "Moscow's Reaction to Captive Nations Week," staged by the award-winning Georgetown University Forum. It explains in detail the points I have been making here:

#### MOSCOW'S REACTION TO CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Participants: Donald L. Miller, editor of Freedom Facts; Francis McNamara, executive member of the All American Conference To Combat Communism; Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, originator and author of the Captive Nations Week resolution and chairman of the national committee organizing the observance. Moderator: Matthew Warren.

Mr. WARREN. "Moscow's Reaction to Captive Nations Week," the topic for the 711th consecutive broadcast of the Georgetown University Radio Forum, another in a series of educational and informative programs from Washington.

The Georgetown Forum was founded in 1946. This is Matthew Warren speaking by transcription from the Raymond Reiss Studio on the campus of Georgetown University, historic Jesuit seat of learning in the Nation's Capital.

Today's discussion will be on "Moscow's Reaction to Captive Nations Week." The participants are Mr. Donald L. Miller, editor of Freedom Facts and chairman of the Washington Captive Nations Week Committee; Mr. Francis McNamara, executive member of the All American Conference To Combat Communism and member of the staff of the House Un-American Activities Committee; Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, originator and author of the Captive Nations Week resolution and chairman of the national committee organizing the observance.

To begin our discussion, I should like to call your attention to the observance of Captive Nations Week which will take place this year during the week of July 17 to 23.

In 1959 Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution which is now Public Law 86-90. According to the law, the President is authorized to issue an annual proclamation. Committees have been formed in all major cities to observe the spirit of the congressional resolution.

One way to measure the worth of the Captive Nations Week observance is to analyze the Soviet reaction during the past year, which we propose to do during this program.

Dr. Dobriansky, what was the purpose of such a resolution?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. The purpose of the resolution was manifold, I believe. One could say on an overall basis that actually we sought to bring to the attention of the American people the strategic importance of all the captive nations to American security interests.

In addition to this, it is to serve as a vehicle for the advance of freedom in the areas of propaganda, psychological and political warfare. By emphasizing the contents of this resolution, not only during Captive Nations Week but in the course of the entire year, I sincerely believe that we would be able to offset the propaganda advances made by Moscow.

Mr. WARREN. Would you say, then, it was designed to stir up the people of the captive nations?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Yes; in the sense of stirring them up to this fact and realization, that the people in the United States are ever cognizant of their captive status and that we will explore every possible peaceable means to bring about their eventual liberation and freedom.

I want to emphasize that contrary to many of the speculations at the time the resolu-

tion was passed by Congress, and certainly after the reaction on the part of Moscow, when many newspapers claimed that actually the resolution sought to make the American people cognizant of the plight of these captive nations, it does more than that.

It is not simply to recognize that they are in this captive status but to see and understand, as I put it before, the strategic importance of all of the captive nations. I am not just referring to those in satellite Europe, meaning central Europe, but I am also taking into account the captive nations within the U.S.S.R. and those in Asia. And, taken in the aggregate, you have a very imposing factor here.

Mr. WARREN. How do American individuals participate in such an observance other than to be cognizant of it?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. The resolution passed by Congress calls, of course, upon all Americans to observe Captive Nations Week. In the course of this week, which is the third week of July, individuals and groups in their respective localities are expected to engage in religious services, to have rallies, discussion meetings, even editorial comments through various journalistic media; and in the course of such thinking and reasoning about the captive nations—again, taken in the aggregate—it is hoped that our people would in turn press for more formidable and really more successful cold war media on the part of our Government in offsetting the perilous threat of Moscow.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. McNamara, shortly after this resolution was passed last year the Soviet Premier, Khrushchev, appeared to be very upset by asking numerous questions of the then visiting Vice President Nixon.

Why do you suppose he was so upset?

Mr. McNAMARA. Well, one reason, I would say, was because this resolution pricked his conscience; it hit him in a very sensitive spot. His violent reaction to the proposal indicated this. To quote Shakespeare, "He did protest too much." This usually indicates that they know they are wrong and they feel guilty. I think that this was the major reason for his violent reaction; that he knew that this charge was true; and he screamed and protested the way he did in a more or less desperate effort to offset the effectiveness and the truth contained in this resolution.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Mr. McNAMARA, may I ask, "Would you agree that Khrushchev exploded and reacted violently against this resolution because of certain new qualities contained in the resolution?"

What I have in mind here is the fact that for years we have been talking about certain captive nations. The President and our Secretaries of State talked about them over the Voice of America and other media. Surely right up to the time of the Hungarian revolution there was a great deal of talk about the captive nations. But, significantly, the concept was largely restricted to central Europe: whereas here for the first time we have a governmental document which lists numerous and all the captive nations; in fact, the majority of them exist outside of central Europe, both within the Soviet Union and, in addition, in Asia.

Because of this new element—namely, this recognition that the Soviet Union is not a nationally integrated state, that, instead, it is really made up of numerous nations and that they are captive in the sense that the resolution conveys captivity—this, I think, rocked Khrushchev.

Would you agree with this interpretation?

Mr. McNAMARA. I do. I believe that is undoubtedly true. Another element is this, that Moscow has been demanding self-determination in all parts of the world for many years, always throwing the charge of colonialism against the Western Powers generally and demanding that the people in Latin America, who are allegedly enslaved by U.S. imperial-

ism, the people in Asia, Africa, and so forth, be allowed to determine their own form of government, be given independence.

Here for the first time, really, the United States officially challenged Khrushchev on this point. We threw his challenge back to him and demanded that he permit self-determination in the nations that he, the great imperialist, has enslaved.

This, I think, was a very good thing. We have been more or less backing away and not doing much before in answer to this challenge and the propaganda that he had issued on the theme of self-determination.

Here we were answering him and doing it so very effectively, I might add.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Miller, do you recall some other incidents of violent Soviet reaction?

Mr. MILLER. I think the Russian Communist reaction to Captive Nations Week was quite dramatic. We have to remember that this was not a U-2 incident. We did not actually invade or cross Russian territory.

We merely stated a principle and a point of view. The reaction to that was somewhat surprising. A few days after Captive Nations Week began here, on July 22, Pravda came out with quite a vitriolic editorial which condemned Captive Nations Week and made a very strong point of the fact that the Socialist camp is firm and strong as never before.

The following day, as you probably remember, Vice President Nixon visited the Soviet Union and nearly the first word which Khrushchev addressed to him was to the effect, "Well, here you are coming to visit and take a look at the captives."

Throughout Mr. Nixon's visit to the Soviet Union, Khrushchev and a number of hecklers in the crowds came up to him and asked him about the captives, and tried to persuade him that the people in the Soviet Union really were not captives.

To demonstrate this, on July 22 Khrushchev took Nixon on a boat trip and showed him a number of Russian bathers. He used the phrase, "Here are your captives. See how happy they look."

But the most surprising expression from the Russian Communist came on July 30, when the propagandists told their own people that Captive Nations Week had failed. They suggested that the reason that they thought it had failed, was because during the week none of the peoples in the captive nations had revolted.

I don't believe that anyone in the United States had expected a revolt during that particular week, but apparently many of the Russian Communists did.

I think we can make two deductions from this. One is that Captive Nations Week hits a very weak spot in the Communist armor; and the second is that we can do this without even leaving our own communities.

Mr. WARREN. Dr. Dobriansky, it sounds to me as if Mr. Khrushchev was your best publicity agent.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. To that I would agree. As a matter of fact, the publicity agent served our purposes in many ways, having made this known to the peoples and nations within the entire Communist empire and, at the same time, having made it known even to our American people, despite the fact that many of them still down to this day don't really understand the meaning and the significance of this resolution.

But before saying anything about that, I would like Mr. McNamara to discuss perhaps some of the reactions in the so-called satellite area of central Europe. Moscow alone was not in this game of violent and vehement rebuttal against the resolution.

Mr. WARREN. Would you first point up the difference between a "satellite" and a "captive nation"?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Frankly, I don't accept this distinction in connection with the various nations within the Communist world.

A satellite, a political satellite in its true sense would be, let us say, Portugal in relation to Great Britain. One wouldn't say that Portugal was in any state of enslavement, but it was a satellite in terms of the general directions of British foreign policy.

Analogous to that, I imagine, one can justify somewhat the use of the term "satellite" to Yugoslavia. That was the reason Yugoslavia was not contained in this resolution.

But with regard to the countries that we oftentimes, I think, misapply the term "satellite," the term "captive nation" is vastly more accurate and appropriate.

What does it indicate? It simply indicates that each of these nations, those in central Europe, those within the U.S.S.R., those in Asia, have been subjected by force to a foreign yoke. They are under the domination of the policy of that foreign yoke, meaning Moscow.

I say this in full cognizance of the supposed cleavage between Peiping and Moscow.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. McNAMARA.

Mr. McNAMARA. As Dr. Dobriansky mentioned, there was violent reaction to this resolution not only on Khrushchev's part and within the Soviet Union itself but in all of the other captive nations.

In Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Poland, Albania, East Germany, all the official propaganda media—radio, the newspapers, controlled press, and so forth—all were extremely vitriolic and loud in their denunciations of the resolution.

They charged that it was interference in their internal affairs, just as Moscow did. They charged it was a threat to peace, and so forth. I believe that this violent reaction throughout the Soviet empire indicates how fearful Moscow is of this resolution and the ideas contained in it.

You see, Khrushchev denounces this resolution very loudly. But if you just stop to think of it you can realize that, if this charge on the part of the U.S. Congress against the Soviet Union was false, he could so easily prove it by just allowing free elections within the Soviet empire. And if, as he claims, they are not captive nations, they would all vote for continued Soviet enslavement; and, then, he could turn around and laugh in our face and make the United States look ridiculous.

Of course, he will never risk this because he knows in truth that they are captive nations and, if given a chance to vote, they would overwhelmingly, from all the evidence that we can gather, reject Soviet and Communist rule.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. If I may interrupt; another aspect, I think, that should be mentioned is that this reaction on the part of Moscow and the puppets was not restricted in a time length to 1 week or 2 weeks at the end of last July.

On the contrary, the reaction was perpetuated so that going into the following months of the year, right down to December, as far as I know, the Communist organs continued to lambast this particular resolution.

For example, in August, you recall, the month before Khrushchev made his arrival in the United States, they played up an article of his that appeared in the Foreign Affairs journal. It was an October issue, but an advance publicity was given to it. In this particular article, which I have before me, Khrushchev regards the resolution as "an act of provocation."

The interesting thing about this is that he offers a challenge to the sponsors of the resolution and the backers of it, in the sense that he raises the question: "How would America and Americans have felt if the Parliament of Mexico had, for instance, passed a similar resolution demanding that Texas, Arizona, and California be liberated from American slavery?"

Now, after this appeared, I prepared a question which was submitted to one Sena-

tor who eventually, the following month, presented this to Khrushchev at the tea party given by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. And the question was this: Fine, Mr. Khrushchev. In view of the fact that you used Texas, Arizona, and California, let us use comparable areas within the Soviet Union: Ukraine for Texas, the Caucasian nations for California, and Lithuania for Arizona. Let us, under U.N. supervision, have the respective peoples in their areas vote: in our area here, for example, whether our Texans want to remain with the United States, join Mexico, or be independent, and there, whether the Ukrainians want to remain with Moscow, join some other unit, or be independent.

The question, I understand, was posed to him and he refused even to recognize it.

Mr. WARREN. How many times has the United Nations rebuked Mr. Khrushchev in this connection and he has ignored it completely. Why should this particular thing worry him even more? Mr. Miller, would you like to answer that one?

Mr. MILLER. I think Captive Nations Week goes right to the heart of one of the great problems of the Soviet Empire, that is, the problem of nationalities.

Joseph Stalin a number of years ago built his reputation as a Communist theorist on the basis that he had solved the nationalities problem.

His solution consisted of saying, "Let's tell the people in the various nations that they can be free and equal within the Communist bloc, that they can maintain their own language and their own culture, and get the benefits of being in this larger group"; at the same time, all these nations are ruled by Communist Party leaders who owe their jobs and their loyalties to Moscow. So that in reality all the nations are ruled directly from Moscow.

This is a very thin kind of deception which the Communists have been using in respect to the captive nations within the U.S.S.R. They have been using it in respect to the nations in central Europe.

To these people in central Europe, for example, Khrushchev says time and time again, "Your government is entirely in the hands of your own people."

Well, the people in these countries know this isn't true because they know that they are ruled by the Communist Party leaders and these party leaders are responsible to Moscow.

So that when Captive Nations Week and the American people come out and say the truth about this matter, Khrushchev feels that the very statement of the truth is a deadly threat to the whole unity and the so-called solidity of the Communist empire.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. That is a very important point, in my judgment, for it advances the weapon of truth. In the past few months we have been talking about the diplomacy of truth.

It would seem to me, in answer to your original question, that the contents of this resolution, if properly elaborated, would give us many new truths which we could use in this area of the cold war.

I am one who is convinced that this is the only course for us. Knowing something about the cold war pursued by St. Petersburg and Moscow even prior to the coming of the Communists, about the manner in which they built up their empire over the centuries, about the ways they have developed their cold war techniques, I feel that it is in the propaganda, psychopolitical area where ultimately the final decision will be made in this life-or-death struggle.

In this case the resolution gives us many channels, many dimensions that we could pursue, diplomatically, in the propaganda area, even in the economic area. If one considers, for example, the disposition of resources within the U.S.S.R., one finds that

most of the important resources in any single area are concentrated in Turkestan or in Ukraine.

Turkestan is a huge area and it is properly listed as one of the captive nations in this resolution. I submit that Khrushchev and the others in the Kremlin began to suspect that perhaps there would be a popular appreciation in this country of the immense psychopolitical possibilities that are truly open to us.

Unfortunately, when one looks at the record—and I have here quite a number of news clippings, editorials, and comments by our analysts concerning the Captive Nations Week resolution and the President's proclamation—I must say that many of our people simply didn't understand it last year.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. McNAMARA, what evidence do we have that the people in the captive nations are aware of this resolution?

Mr. McNAMARA. Well, they must be aware of it. We know this because of the extensive coverage given the resolution in the press, over the radio and in other communications media within the captive nations.

One thing I would like to point out is the importance of the captive peoples, in this respect, of maintaining peace in the world today.

We hear an awful lot about this and various plans are being advanced for preventing the outbreak of war, and so on. I believe the captive peoples have been possibly as important a factor as our atomic bomb, when we had a monopoly on it, in preserving peace in this world.

This is because of their resistance to the Kremlin. The Soviet Empire has a fifth column that is larger in numbers and more intensely hates the regime than any nation in the world has ever experienced before.

It is largely because of this resentment, as demonstrated in the uprising in East Germany in 1953 and Poznan, Poland, in early 1956, in Hungary in October 1956, that the Soviet Union is afraid to start a war, because it knows that the moment that it does, there will be a huge outbreak behind its own lines and it will be sabotaged.

So I think this resolution is extremely important as a peace preserver because it shows the captive peoples that we are on their side, that we are working, thinking of their freedom and independence, that we recognize the fact that they are enslaved and captive.

This tends to keep up their resistance, bolster their courage so they will continue to be a thorn in the side of the Communist regime.

Mr. WARREN. Dr. Dobriansky, you said something a few moments ago that interested me in reminding us of the supposed cleavage between China and Soviet Russia. Would you call the people of China, first of all, captives?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Yes; and it is so indicated in the resolution.

Mr. WARREN. All right—

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Mainland China, mind you.

Mr. WARREN. Then do you suppose that your resolution would enable those captives in mainland China to be hopeful of some help in the future?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. That depends. It is one thing to have a resolution; another thing to observe a Captive Nations Week which is provided by the resolution; it is a third thing—and we are hopeful of this—to begin to recognize, as Mr. McNAMARA well stated here, that the captive nations in the aggregate are really one of our greatest deterrents against the outbreak of a hot war.

If we are interested in preserving peace; that is, no hot global outbreak, then we should be vitally interested in all of these captive nations, including those on mainland China.

This is what I meant when I said that this whole issue is significantly affected by a very



important strategic factor in connection with American security and also in connection with our desire to maintain the peace.

Mr. WARREN. What would be the next natural step?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. The next natural step would be to set up our cold war apparatus, and this doesn't mean leading us into a hot war; on the contrary, it means we will be implementing the intent and the purpose of this particular resolution to prevent a hot global war and to win the cold war.

We are finally becoming more realistic with regard to the cold war advances of the Russian totalitarians and the very nature of the cold war being waged by Moscow.

I ask you, "Must we always be subjected to shock treatments?" For example, an eruption occurs in the Middle East. Many of our leaders are shocked. Observers there knew what was transpiring right along. I am not suggesting that the problem of Arab nationalism is nonexistent, but also there is the problem of sinister Russian infiltration. The same thing in Cuba. The same thing in Japan. I would add also the same thing in San Francisco with the House Un-American Activities Committee. When we face these events, immediately people, as though babes in the wood, including Senators, Congressmen, and others, express their shock.

There is nothing to be shocked about. You have had a whole series of these, and there will be more. Instead of depending upon shock treatments it is about time we realized fully the nature of this cold war process and proceeded to build up that kind of apparatus to cope with it.

There has been a host of proposals, well-rooted proposals, realistic proposals, along this line.

Mr. WARREN. We only have a few seconds remaining. Would you again tell us the dates of the upcoming Captive Nations Week?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Captive Nations Week this year will be held and observed during the week of July 17-23, and in many major cities local committees have been set up to observe this week.

Mr. WARREN. Gentlemen, thank you very much for your participation in this discussion of "Moscow's Reaction to Captive Nations Week." The participants, Donald L. Miller, editor of Freedom Facts, chairman of the Washington Captive Nations Week; Mr. Francis McNamara, executive member of the All American Conference To Combat Communism and member of the staff of the House Un-American Activities Committee; Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, originator and author of the Captive Nations Week resolution and chairman of the national committee organizing the observance.

Mr. Speaker, a meaningful and knowing belief in the individuality of freedom does not permit a restriction of freedom to some nations, as, for example, the so-called satellites in Central Europe, and its exclusion as concerns others, as, for example, the more numerous captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. like Ukraine, Lithuania, Turkestan, Armenia, White Ruthenia, Latvia, and others. The resolution is founded on this belief. From the overall viewpoint of propaganda and psycho-political war, Moscow displayed its fear of any intensive American concern with the freedom of these captive non-Russian nations in the primary sphere of its farflung empire, namely the Soviet Union itself. The concept of captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. is anathema to it because its proper development and elaboration would produce an entirely dif-

ferent and accurate image of the Soviet Union in world opinion. We have yet to develop this concept, this new dimension, and begin to take long strides in overwhelming Moscow's psycho-political offensive which necessarily has always been its chief mode of attack. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that the editors of the New York Times stress this very essential point in their August 8 editorial, titled "The New Imperialism." At this point I request that this illuminating editorial be made part of my remarks. In addition, I wish to introduce also an article on "The Myth of Soviet Unity" which appeared in the May issue of the Sign magazine. This article explains in detail the new imperialism referred to by the Times editor:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 8, 1960]

#### THE NEW IMPERIALISM

If the possibilities were not so grave, there would be much for the world to laugh at in Moscow's posturing over both Cuba and the Congo. In both these situations the Soviet Union is trying to appear before humanity as the great enemy of imperialism, the friend of oppressed peoples everywhere. The sad truth, apparent to anyone with an elementary knowledge of Soviet history, is that the Soviet Union is today the last remaining great imperialist state, the only colonial power which today rules more conquered territory and more subject peoples than it did a quarter of a century ago.

When Americans think of the captive nations, their thoughts normally turn first to the countries of Eastern Europe upon which Communist dictatorship was imposed by the Red Army a decade and a half ago. Of the Eastern European nations, only Yugoslavia today can claim to be truly independent and sovereign, having survived almost a decade of Stalinist political, economic and subversive warfare aimed at turning it into a satellite. The bitterness of the Hungarian people at their enslavement broke out fiercely in the revolution less than 4 years ago, a revolution drowned in blood by Soviet troops. The real feelings of the Polish people were expressed a year ago by the tremendous ovation Vice President Nixon received when he visited Warsaw, but the Gomulka regime has to conduct itself in cognizance of the reality of Soviet military forces on either side of Poland.

But if the Eastern European satellites are still allowed to keep the trappings of outward sovereignty, the same cannot be said of the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union. Twenty years ago the independence of the Baltic States—Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia—was extinguished by acts of crude aggression. Red Army invasion of those states was followed by farcical elections which ended those nations' freedom, though not their love of liberty.

The list of other nations imprisoned in the Soviet Union is long. The Ukrainians are today one of the advanced peoples of Europe, yet Kiev is a mere provincial capital ruled from Moscow. In the Transcaucasus, the Georgians, Armenians and Azerbaidzhanis have known freedom in their history, but know it no longer. In Central Asia the Kazakhs, the Uzbeks, the Kirghiz, the Turkmens, the Tadzhiks and other smaller peoples are denied independence and liberty.

If Moscow really were an enemy of imperialism it would give liberty to the non-Russian peoples now subject to its will. But in this era when the former Western colonial powers have been and are rapidly making their former colonies sovereign nations, there

is no evidence of a similar trend in Moscow's empire. Rather the witch hunt against true patriots among the Soviet subject peoples goes on unceasingly, as does the campaign to Russify these peoples, their cultures and their histories. On the issue of imperialism, therefore, Moscow stands at the bar of world opinion with blood and dirt on her own hands.

[From the Sign, May 1960]

#### THE MYTH OF SOVIET UNITY

(By Lev Dobriansky)

Propaganda is the Russian Communists' most important weapon in the cold war. Out of a strange mixture of truths, half-truths, and bald lies, they have cunningly devised an amazing system of deception. Chief among their deceptions is the myth of Soviet unity.

This myth is kept alive only as long as we remain ignorant of the facts. It is high time we exploded the myth with knowledge of the truth.

What Americans do not know about Russia came to light painfully last July when a joint resolution, unanimously passed by Congress, called for the observance of Captive Nations Week. Now Public Law 86-90, this congressional act is the first official recognition which our Government has made of the existence of non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union.

The act of Congress mentions many captive nations without and within the U.S.S.R. borders. Deceived by Russian propaganda, Americans had long thought of captive nations only in terms of the satellites in Eastern and Central Europe.

When the resolution was made public, reporters, commentators, and the public inquired, "Where is White Ruthenia? Where is Cossackia?" Many admitted that they had never heard of Idel-Ural or Azerbaijan or even Turkestan. Meanwhile, a number of writers and analysts continued along their merry but blind way to apply this act of Congress solely to those minority captive nations in central Europe.

Those who investigated the situation were astonished to discover that there are more captive nations within the U.S.S.R. than there are without. They were surprised to learn that the people of those captive nations within the Soviet borders outnumber all the Russians combined.

When the joint resolution was passed, few Americans appreciated this fact. But Khrushchev did. Knowing the implications of President Eisenhower's proclamation of Captive Nations Week, he exploded.

Khrushchev was aroused because he wants to hide from the free world the fact that Russia, although a political giant, is a giant with clay feet—a giant whose framework is made up of many different strands.

We must understand some important distinctions between tribes, nations, states, voluntary federations, and tyrannically constructed empires.

The state, it should be noted, is simply the political aspect of the nation. Sometimes you have several nations voluntarily existing in one state, as in Switzerland. Again, you may have one nation being ruled, in separate parts, by two governments, as in Ireland. Again, many nations, against their will, may be politically and tyrannically controlled by one superimposed government, as in the Soviet Union.

After World War I, the present captive nations within the U.S.S.R. were newly independent states. In the collapsing Russian Empire, after World War I, Lithuania, Georgia, Armenia, and other non-Russian nations declared their political independence. They were free of Czarist control. Furthermore, they had no mind to submit to Communist control from Moscow. They established themselves as free democratic

republics. Ukraine and Georgia were even recognized as separate states by Lenin's Soviet Russia.

We remember well the tragic fate that overtook independent Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, and others in the forties. But what most of us forget is that similar tragedies befell Georgia, the Ukraine, White Ruthenia, and others in the early twenties. Trotsky's Red Russian Army had picked them off one by one after softening them up by infiltration, subversion, propaganda, etc.

By 1923, following the first wave of Red Russian imperialism, these non-Russian nations were forced into the spurious federation called the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Because of their large populations and their natural resources, these non-Russian nations formed the base for Moscow's further imperialist thrust into central Europe. Currently they form the base for Russian colonial designs in the Middle East, Asia, and Africa.

Yet—and here is a basic point which Americans must grasp—these non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R. have not passively accepted the Soviet yoke. Each decade since the twenties has seen serious friction, resistance, even open rebellion scald the hand of their Moscow masters.

This struggle continues. Not a month goes by that Moscow does not launch a fresh attack against this nationalistic trend. Indeed, this opposition to Moscow pressured Stalin to bid for the inclusion of Ukraine and Byelorussia as original members of the United Nations. From time to time Moscow finds it expedient to pretend that the non-Russian republics are independent. Amendments to the U.S.S.R. constitution provide for these republics to have their own war ministries and to enter into direct diplomatic relations with other states. Moscow clearly does not underestimate the reality of these restless nations.

In December 1957 Khrushchev addressed the Supreme Soviet in Ukraine. He referred to Ukraine as "a truly free and independent nation."

But Nikita Khrushchev is not fooling the Ukrainians—and he dreads their genuine nationalism. Even during the illusory "Spirit of Camp David" his agents in Munich assassinated the Ukrainian nationalist leader, Stefan Bandera, and, under the economic disguise of voluntary resettlements, Khrushchev is currently engineering the deportation of families from western Ukraine to central Asia and the Crimea.

These non-Russian nations within the Soviet borders are ancient peoples with long histories and periods of national freedom. Ukraine has 42 million people, the biggest non-Russian nation within the U.S.S.R. The three Baltic nations number 6 million; White Ruthenia (Byelorussia), 10.8 million; Georgia, 4 million; Armenia, 1.8 million; Azerbaijan, 3.7 million; and Turkmen, purposely divided by Moscow into five republics, (Kazakh, Tadzhik, Kirghiz, Turkmen, Uzbek), 22.9 million. And to these some 10 million ethnic and nationally conscious Cossacks located above the Caucasus, and about 15 million Moslems concentrated in the Idel-Ural (Volga-Ural) country, and you wind up with the sizable figure of about 114 million people. This figure covers only 11 compact ethnic and national non-Russian units. There are many small tribal units besides. The Russians number 96 million. Kremlin propaganda concerning the economic progress of the U.S.S.R. would take on a different color if it were subjected to the searching light of reality.

Moscow is supervising an uneasy conglomeration of many nations within the borders of the U.S.S.R. and a restless system of additional colonies outside its borders.

An economy based on extensive captive resources can hardly be compared with a free

national economy. Most of the resources within the U.S.S.R. are concentrated in non-Russian areas; agriculture in Ukraine, Turkmen, and Georgia; coal in Ukraine and Turkmen; oil in Azerbaijan and Idel-Ural; 90 percent of the manganese in Georgia and Ukraine; iron ore in the Caucasus and Ukraine. Turkmen, three times the combined size of Britain, France, and Germany, alone accounts for about half the copper, lead, zinc output, and is also rich in bauxite and silver.

Soviet propaganda concerning the military might of the U.S.S.R. also acquires a different shade of meaning when confronted with facts. Forty-three percent of the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. are non-Russian. Even apart from likely Russian defections, this is most significant. As for potential Ukrainian, Russian, and other defections, Hungary has furnished the most recent example of what may happen.

Despite their inner weaknesses, the Russians have not only manufactured a myth of unity and invincible strength but they have managed to have the myth accepted by America. The myth has been swallowed not only by the public but by newsmen, commentators, columnists, and political leaders in high levels of Government. A few examples:

The New York Times, October 21, 1958: "Cardinal Agagianian is Russian by birth, having been born near Tiflis." This statement makes about as much sense as asserting that "Cardinal D'Alton is English by birth, having been born in the British Empire." Cardinal D'Alton is Irish and Cardinal Agagianian is Armenian.

Returning from a visit to the U.S.S.R., Adlai Stevenson wrote: "Russia is still a land of sharp and vivid contrasts." He meant the U.S.S.R.

Last July the Governors Report on the Soviet Visit was issued. Referring to the United States and the U.S.S.R., the report stated: "Ways must be devised for the people of these two major nations to understand each other." Even Khrushchev, speaking to various peoples within his Empire, would not go so far as to call the U.S.S.R. a nation.

We would expect the U.S. Office of Education would be correctly informed. Yet, in its U.S. Mission's Report on Education in the Soviet Union, we read: "The one fact that most impressed us in the U.S.S.R. was the extent to which the nation is committed to education as a means of national advancement." Actually, our Government still recognizes the free Governments of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

I can almost hear my readers complaining that I am indulging in semantics. But this is not merely semantics. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY would resent it very much if people kept calling him RICHARD M. NIXON and vice versa. Everyone likes to retain his own identity, his own background, character, and intentions. So do peoples and nations.

The cold war today is being waged basically on the propaganda level. Hearts and minds of men are the primary targets. This has always been Russia's empire-building mode of attack. But Moscow's lies will eventually smash themselves against the hard reality of truth. Truth makes men free, and we can begin to triumph over imperialist Russian totalitarianism once we replace our misconceptions of Russia with knowledge of the truth. The Captive Nations Resolution was a start. It is tragic that Moscow knows this better than we.

#### THE IDEAS OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The millions of Americans who observed Captive Nations Week did so not out of any superficial sentiment for the oppressed and occupied nations, but by reason of certain basic convictions concerning the overriding issue of the totalitarian imperialism and democratic na-

tional freedom. The first of these convictions refers to the nature of the conflict. The chief struggle is not in the nuclear, military, or economic field as such, but rather in the overall, totalistic propaganda and psychopolitical area which embraces the products of the other individual fields. Recent events in Tokyo, Italy, Cuba, and elsewhere should bring home to us the methodical techniques of political abrasion that no amount of armament could deal with. The main arena is ideas and the ultimate weapon is man.

Observing Captive Nations Week, our citizens expressed a second important conviction. And that is that the only way to prevent a hot global war is to win the psychological cold war by the prime ideology of all the captive nations. As Winston Churchill once put it, "If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed, you may have to fight when there is no hope of victory because it is better to perish than to live as slaves." Of all the existing challenges before us, the prime and really only mortal challenge to our national existence is Moscow's imperialist challenge.

The third conviction is that our Declaration of Independence, wisely externalized and made applicable to all people and nations, provides the moral and political truths—as well as unsurpassable national purposes—for us to cage the bear. Many of us are simply unaware of the powerful ideologic weapons we have in our possession, but these weapons have yet to be skillfully and effectively used.

It is the height of irony that Moscow cynically exploits the principle of natural self-determination and independence in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, whereas we, the natural bearers of this principle, fear to apply it in the one area which is most crucial to us in any type of war, hot or cold. The area of the Soviet Union itself. Pertinent to this aspect is an address that was delivered over the Manion Network under the title "We Must Declare For Independence of Captive Nations." I include it as part of my remarks here:

#### WE MUST DECLARE FOR INDEPENDENCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

DEAN MANION. Emerson once wrote that "nature is an endless combination and repetition of a very few laws." Upon these dependable "laws of nature and of nature's God" the National Independence of the United States was launched 184 years ago this week.

Just as nature wisely repeats its inflexible elementary laws, this program has repetitiously stressed the all-important historic consequence of those same basic principles, namely, the sovereign Independence of these United States.

The ringing declaration of these laws of nature, which made us a free, independent Nation in 1776, needs endless reiteration now, an ominous time, certainly, when the laws of God and nature are being flouted in the Satanic Communist conquest of all mankind.

We now need to remember that the sacred principles that made us free can keep us free and, in the process, defeat communism and liberate the world.

This truth is the rationale of the Captive Nations Resolution which Congress passed last year, and of our Captive Nations Week



observance which a national committee of prominent Americans is now organized to promote.

I have the distinguished chairman of that committee with me at this microphone now. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky is professor of economics at Georgetown University, and he is also a great champion of human liberty. Dr. Dobriansky, I want to take this occasion to thank you publicly for the leading part you played in the conception and adoption of the congressional Captive Nations Resolution. It is a pleasure to welcome you to the Manion Forum.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Thank you, Dean Manion. Tomorrow we Americans, throughout this land and also abroad, will be celebrating the Independence of our Nation.

To all patriotic citizens this sacred day symbolizes, under God, our national freedom, the untampered will of a sovereign people, our firm determination to meet any enemy who would attempt to destroy our hard-won independence.

It symbolizes, too, the spiritual and moral power of our great tradition, the liberal institutions of this country, and the warm humanism of its laws.

Friends, I am not sounding any super or ultrapatriotic note when I emphasize that our Spirit of Independence is at once our past, our present, and our future. Different peoples throughout the world see the meaning and essence of this Nation more objectively and even more appreciatively than many of us do.

The European writer, R. L. Bruckberger, in his remarkable book, "Image of America," rightly maintains that the religiously inspired perennial principles and tenets in our Declaration of Independence belong today not only to the American people but to all the peoples and nations of the world, particularly those in Moscow's farflung totalitarian empire.

The philosopher, Jacques Maritain, in his book, "Reflections on America," views the development of this Nation as a unique and unprecedented historical phenomenon and says, "all this talk about American materialism is no more than a curtain of silly gossip and slander."

Our Nation, built on the free and creative energies of people drawn from every quarter of the globe, is a unique historical experiment—indeed, the great experiment of mankind. Our Nation is a living revolution that moves the hearts and minds of freedom-aspiring peoples everywhere; again, particularly those in captive Eurasia.

In the full perspective of the history of mankind, we, as a united, prosperous, and peaceful people, have with all humility every reason to be proud of our unique development and rich tradition.

Our society, to be sure, is not perfect. But, by all evidence, it is unquestionably one that has given so much in so many ways to so many within a short span in the history of man. It is one which has made this Nation most powerful, exemplary, and respected everywhere.

Contrary to some false notions, we do possess an ideology which inspires our continued growth as a morally leading nation and remarkably equips us to contend successfully with the present threat of imperialist Red totalitarianism.

#### AMERICAN IDEOLOGY DEFINITE AND DISTINCT

This ideology is plainly and precisely spelled out in our Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. Normal American citizens, like you and myself, know the principles of freedom enshrined in these historic documents and the purposes they necessarily imply for the continued growth and leadership of our Nation.

A few in this country seem to think otherwise. It is a sad commentary on the faith that these few have in the strength and

vision of the American people, no less in the political and moral foundations of our Nation, where they believe that by setting up a committee to define our national purposes, they could either improve upon or supplant the purposes and objectives of our Nation as provided by our own Declaration of Independence.

On this Independence Day it is vitally important for us to reflect upon the moral and political principles embodied in the declaration. Nuclear weapons, missiles, luniks, and the whole array of new technologic innovations—which by nature are only instruments and means—cannot reshape or antiquate these natural norms of civilized human existence.

Even more important at this time is the application of the perennial principles of national and individual independence to other nations and peoples. For, not only is the living application of these principles crucial to the further growth and development of our Nation, but it is also indispensable to the existence and survival of the nontotalitarian free world.

What a moving and powerful force our Declaration of Independence was on the various nations which were subjugated in the empires of the last century and a half.

Nations in the Russian, Austro-Hungarian, and Ottoman empires soon rose at the beginning of this century to declare their independence with a will to pursue an independent national existence similar to ours. But, in significant part, this was short lived as the unchecked surge of Russian totalitarian imperialism since 1918 once again reduced the many non-Russian nations of Eastern Europe and Asia to servility.

Today, we ourselves are seriously threatened by this barbaric peril. Worst of all, in our confusion, generated in great degree by the tremendous propaganda skill of the enemy, we aren't even aware of the enormous opportunities we have to defeat this menace in the cold war and thus stave off a hot global war.

The way, I believe, was demonstrated last year with the passage by the Congress of the Captive Nations Week Resolution. What this resolution, now Public Law 86-90, calls for is, in essence, a universalized Declaration of Independence.

For the first time, our Government recognized the fundamental fact that the Soviet Union itself is an empire, in which the majority of people constitute captive non-Russian nations. In addition to the three captive non-Russian Baltic nations, there are White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, Idel-Ural, and Turkestan—held captive and occupied by foreign Moscow.

Following World War I, each of these—as did Poland, Finland, and others—broke away from Russian imperial rule, only to be reconquered one by one on the divide-and-conquer principle. Without these economically rich non-Russian colonies in the Soviet Union, Russia, with less than half of the population of the Soviet Union, would be only a second-rate power.

When Congress passed this resolution last July, you will recall that Khrushchev reacted violently and fearfully. He persistently sought to reassure Vice President Nixon that there were no captives in the U.S.S.R.

Unfortunately, in our country the greater part of our press was puzzled and bewildered by this development; in fact, many for the first time learned that there are nations like Turkestan and Cossackia in the U.S.S.R.

#### KHRUSHCHEV FEARS INTERNAL AWAKENING

Now, why did Khrushchev react with such verbal violence against this resolution? Our Government spoke often in the past about the few captive nations in Central Europe—the so-called satellites—and, yet, no such reaction was produced.

The answer lies in the fact that there is a serious colonial problem within the Soviet Union, which Moscow calls "bourgeois nationalism"; and if this is dragged out into the spotlight of world attention and opinion, the proper characterization of Russian Moscow as the last major colonial and imperialist power in the world would be devastating to its propaganda and cold war efforts. Khrushchev well understood this and ranted against the resolution months after; we remained puzzled and bewildered, and muffed our opportunity.

Our opportunity, I am convinced, will come once we realize the following:

1. That the Soviet Union is an empire in itself, holding in bondage the majority of the captive nations in the Red totalitarian world.

2. That the issues of colonialism and imperialism within the Soviet Union are prime targets for our national concern.

3. That the chief type of warfare Moscow—and, before it, St. Petersburg—wages is propaganda warfare, one that we must equal and surpass.

4. That the cold war will be as permanent as the colonial imperium maintained by Moscow from the Danube to the Pacific.

5. That the universalization of our own Declaration of Independence is the appropriate and most formidable weapon in this type of war. Initiative, positive action, imaginative ideas can be ours with these new dimensions of thought.

The recent events in Paris, Japan, Cuba—indeed, in our own San Francisco—are not shocking to those who understand Moscow's traditional techniques. It has built an unprecedented empire by them.

These events should bring us back to the realities of the main struggle, for which we are, unhappily, poorly prepared. Toward this end, citizens throughout the country have formed in Washington the National Captive Nations Week Committee. In accordance with Public Law 86-90, the committee is stimulating a nationwide observance of Captive Nations Week beginning July 17.

We earnestly hope you will join in this observance. The Independence we enjoy, and will celebrate tomorrow, can only be preserved if we begin to translate it for all of the captive nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union, 2 weeks hence.

Don't be fooled by the slogan "coexistence or codestruction"; the real alternative is a policy of emancipation, beating Moscow at its cold war propaganda game. This we can do with hitherto unused weapons of truth; and year by year we can truly find ourselves deserving to rejoice as a free Nation in 1976, the 200th anniversary of our Declaration of Independence.

In addition to these convictions, Mr. Speaker, the recent countrywide observances of Captive Nations Week expressed also an important view regarding alleged Soviet unity. It holds that the myth of Soviet unity and power must be exploded so that the entire world may see what the Soviet Union really is—a loosely knitted quilt of captive nations where economic colonialism and political imperialism are rampant. Not only in the interest of truth but also in behalf of our stakes in the cold war we should be doing this. Instead of abetting this myth with such misleading concepts as Soviet nation, the Soviet people, and the Soviets, we should be stressing the empire nature of the U.S.S.R.—really the last imperial and colonial center in the world. It requires little reflection to see how this valid conception alters our other fallacious notions about Soviet military power, the Soviet economy, and the like. Mr. Speaker, we can have no hope of successfully competing with Moscow in

the main struggle of ideas, argument, and propaganda, until we correct our own misunderstandings.

By tradition and principle our overall policy cannot but be one of independence aimed at all the captive nations, which necessarily includes those in the Soviet Union. This would be not only in our strategic interest, not only in the interest of the freedom aspirations of all the captive nations, but it would also best aid the approximately 96 million Russian people to attain their independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule. When asked about the Captive Nations Week resolution last year, the President rightly stated:

The United States would never believe and never accept the idea that a true peace had been established in the world until every single nation had the right to express its own views about its own destiny.

It makes little rational sense to hail the new States of Africa which have far less national sinews of historical continuity, geographical contiguity, religion, customs, language, mores, law, common experiences of war and peace, laws, heroes, and arts than the majority captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., and to overlook these nations which are situated at the very base of the enemy of the free world.

#### THE NATIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE

In accordance with Public Law 86-90 our private citizens established the National Captive Nations Committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University, and the executive directorship of Thomas F. Connor. This committee planned and successfully stimulated the observances of Captive Nations Week this past July. As early as last January, Dr. Dobriansky called for such private action in an address delivered to the 1960 Women's Forum on National Security. Because of the pertinent contents of this address, I include it as part of my remarks at this point:

#### JUSTICE AND FREEDOM FOR PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP

(Address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics, Georgetown University faculty member, National War College, 1957-58, before the 1960 Women's Forum on National Security, Hotel Statler-Hilton, Washington, D.C., Jan. 30, 1960)

Ladies of America, your fellow citizens cannot praise you too highly for convening annually in this vital forum to deal with problems of our national security. This year, far more than in previous years, the forum is properly charged with a consciousness of urgency and solemn decision as we face the momentous and determining events of this new decade. It is both a privilege and pleasure for me to exchange with you certain basic thoughts on peace with honor at the very beginning of this decade of decision.

Hypothetically (and it couldn't be otherwise) if Khrushchev were standing here this morning, he would be forced to eat the words he uttered in the spirit of Camp David 2 months ago. Mimicking past dictators, he claimed that the West is hit by old age. (Interview by Maj. Salah Salem, Reuters, Cairo, November 10, 1959.) He illustrated his point by quoting Tolstoy: "When I was young, I was strong with women, but now I feel pain and bitterness—I have a great desire for them but I have no strength." "This," opines Nikita the sanguine, "is ex-

actly the West's attitude." It is obvious that one of the many fundamental subjects he failed to learn during his triumphant cold war visit here is the full power of an American woman. That boundless power is reflected here. And it is this power, diversely generated in the sanctity of the American home, that provides the inspirational drive, the intuitive vision, the courage and will, the principled behavior which help to shape the soul of America. Poor Nikita Sergeyevich, he will never understand that behind American thrones rests the power of American women.

#### FIRST THINGS FIRST

The unique feminine capacity for placing first things first, for planning under the guidance of fixed principle and toward well-defined ends, is a facility by which the so-called intricacies of international relations could be easily unraveled. A study of foreign affairs and how they impinge on our national security demands the exercise of not only the mind but also the heart. Our gestures, our appeals, whether executed through economic, military, diplomatic, or other means, are necessarily directed at both the minds and hearts of peoples elsewhere. The success or failure of these efforts depends primarily on what we stand for, how well and passionately we articulate it, and why we are determined by common will to uphold and advance that for which we really exist. Basically, no matter from what angle of interpretation, the security of our Nation is inextricably tied up with this what, how, and why.

Peace with honor has no meaning without the principles, operational means, and objective ends that are respectively implied by our what, how, and why. Peace with honor carries a price set by these three determinants: by nature, it precludes peace at any price. The very formidability of our military defense structure is also founded on the what, the how, and the why. Billions of dollars worth of the finest military equipment could easily become a heap of junk if the national will to fight were successfully sapped by Moscow's cold war maneuvers. The being of our Nation—what the United States is, means, and symbolizes for people everywhere—subsists in the what of our principles, the how of our methods, and the why of our certitude, will, and vision. Peace with honor is only another way of expressing this national being.

#### JUSTICE AND FREEDOM FOR PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP

Let us examine first the what—the principles by which our Nation has become the most powerful on earth. Derived from our rich Judeo-Christian heritage and natural law, the moral and political principles of intrinsic personal dignity, equality before the law, individual liberty, private opportunity and enterprise, communal welfare, and national self-determination have formed the very foundation of the great tradition which is America. These principles are enshrined in our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and our Bill of Rights which in whatever age—the machine, the atomic, or space—have steadily mirrored the hopes and aspirations of peoples and nations throughout the world. These documents spell out a living and expanding revolution which affects peoples and nations not only in Africa and Asia but also within the Soviet Union itself. Freely blessed for self-criticism, we are the first to say that in the perennial light of these principles, many of our institutions require improvement, reconstruction, and change; but this is no reason for us to shy from the prodigious truth that our society stands in a contrast of day to night to the totalitarian jungle of Moscow's empire.

Those who today are virtually uttering "I'd rather be Red than dead," had no faith in these principles or in themselves

before sputnik, no less after. But since the launching of the sputnik and, with it, Khrushchev's concentrated cold war campaign against the United States, many strange voices have been raised in this country. Their number and their depth attest to the effectiveness of Russian cold war propaganda. Without even knowing it, many have become efficient, costless tools of this propaganda. Worse still, in addition to the many other gaps thrown at us daily, they give witness to the basic intellectual and spiritual gap found in many quarters of our society. Their rantings about coexistence or co destruction, accommodation or war, evolution as opposed to revolution, disarm or perish, and other catchworded themes are not even poised on logic, not to say active, directing principles. Often among these fear mongers, the conception of self-preservation is a crudely physical one and their exhortations amount to an open invitation to national rape.

Ideologically, our firm bent as a Nation can only be along the path of justice and freedom for peace and friendship. Given our time-honored principles, our tested rules of national conduct, logically it could not be otherwise. Khrushchev's offer of peace and friendship is as spurious as his issue of capitalism versus socialism. Yet it is amazing how many in this country uncritically permitted their thoughts to slide with Hitler, the overriding issue with Khrushchev and his puppets is freedom and slavery. One imperialist system was smashed, another surges forth to threaten our national existence. Peace and friendship are the effects, the consequents, of justice and freedom, not their cause. Only through the advance and establishment of justice and freedom can the harmonization of relationships into normal concourse be attained to weld the true bonds of peace and friendship among nations as well as between individuals and groups. As in the case of his predecessors of many centuries, for Khrushchev the slogan of peace and friendship is only an instrument of calculated deception. Its logic rests only in the complacency, doubt, confusion, and naivete it can breed in the camp of the targeted non-Russian victim.

By simple analysis, justice and freedom for peace and friendship is the essence of peace with honor. It logically places first things first, it clearly transports the reality of our national being, and it demandingly calls for activity in thought and deed toward the creative growth of a free world environment. It suggests a more active agency for our thoughts and behavior than does the passive guideline of peace and friendship in freedom. Unending stress upon justice and freedom for peace and friendship alone can provide us, like the trained fighter, with maximum flexibility of action and maneuver against the already compromised opponent. Less than this means our own compromise and thus our curtailed flexibility.

#### THE COLD WAR GAP

Now let us turn to the how—the means, ways, methods by which we articulate, translate, and objectify the what. The efficacy of our methods—the how—depends on how well we understand and perceive the object against whom they are forged and employed. This involves our own conception of the cold war, our knowledge and understanding of the Soviet Union, and our awareness of the primacy of propaganda in the cold war arsenal of Imperial Moscow.

We are barraged nowadays by unbalanced complaints about the missile gap, the big booster gap, the narrowing economic gap, and a host of other subsidiary gaps. This frenzy is doubtlessly to the keen delight of Khrushchev. For the past 2 years his masterful propaganda machinery has so well utilized old Potemkin Village tactics in connection with costly and pointedly concentrated



scientific, technologic, economic, military, and cultural projects that acute political neurosis has burst out in many sectors of our society. This was calculated to aid him immensely on the primary politico-psychological front and at the bargaining table on the diplomatic stage. The psychological treasures of Pushkin, Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy, and others are paying off vastly more than anything Marx was able to produce. Without casting self-reflections, one is almost inclined to say, "It takes a Slav to know a Slav."

Here, too, it is amazing that in all this dither about gaps, the truly most essential gap—the gap that will determine whether we'll plunge disadvantageously into a hot war or face, in moral surrender, a cold war defeat—is scarcely mentioned. The cold war gap, rather than any other gap, has accounted for freedom's tremendous losses these past two decades. Just bear in mind that the tides of freedom even receded when the other gaps were nonexistent. "From Atomic Monopoly and Air Supremacy to the Fear of Annihilation" might not be a pretty caption in the book of some future historian, but it cannot be denied that no nation in modern history has lost so much in so short a time as ours. Even during World War II we failed to understand our hot war ally who bore also the face of our cold war enemy. In the present, we witness the strange spectacle of our USIA Director indicating, in effect, himself and the Agency by trying to rationalize that the sputnik precipitated a worldwide belief in the scientific and technological superiority of the Soviet Union over the United States. By the same token, American Motors is supposed to be superior to General Motors by first exploring the Rambler field.

"The best way to eliminate war," said Khrushchev last year, "is the gaining of power by Communists all over the world." This statement alone gives one an insight into the nature of the cold war. On every continent Moscow is feverishly pursuing its goal of world domination while at the same time professing efforts aimed at a lessening of world tensions. This cold war maneuver has even succeeded in generating the illusion of a cold war cessation here. The plain fact is that cold war activity is a necessary coefficient of the Russian imperialist system and totalitarian structure. On smaller scales, it has always been. In the same way that the elimination of the Iron Curtain or a genuine and extensive liberalization of conditions in Moscow's empire would seal the demise of this empire, so the cessation of cold war operations would dry up its motivating forces of being. In short, the cold war is a basic motive force for the necessary expansionism of Moscow's empire without which its internal totalitarianism would have no justification for existence.

If eventually we are not to be cornered into making the drastic, or better, disastrous choice between a hot war at considerable disadvantage or humiliating cold war surrender, it is indispensable for us now to face up to the cold war gap, to grasp the traditional Russian cold war methods, to establish an efficient cold war apparatus, and to pose our own freedom challenges to Moscow. Those who counter that this might lead to a hot war, not only hide from the realities of the cold war but also, in their thinking, wind up with the *reductio ad absurdum* of this disastrous choice. In a military condition of mutual deterrence, the weight of net advantage naturally favors the one better equipped to wage the cold war. With the cold war gap, this advantage is Moscow's. Missiles, boosters, and evidences of the other gaps have no place in so-called intensive revolutions sparked off by patient subversion, infiltration, blackmail, and other devices in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, South America, and even in

Cuba. Unless one is so far gone with haunting hallucinations of pushbutton co-annihilation, a skillfully executed cold war operation could even balance off, with much to spare, the effects of the other gaps. After all, man will always be the ultimate weapon; and freedom-aspiring men and nations in Moscow's empire are yet our most formidable weapon.

I have defined the cold war as a twilight condition of neither peace nor hot war where all the basic elements of a hot war—predatory design, aggressive strategy, tactics, and techniques—are present, except for open military combat between states. But the cold war, as waged by Moscow, is also a planned process leading to victorious results in time. This is why it is an illusion to speak of peace while this process is going on relentlessly and with increasing Russian confidence and arrogance. The prevalence of peace, thus, is measured not only by the absence of a hot war but also by the absence of a cold war and all that it entails.

Our situation in the cold war gap today embraces both a supreme paradox and an imposing irony. The supreme paradox is that while we fear to meet the demands of the cold war because it might lead to a hot war, Moscow shows no fear of a hot war resulting from its intense cold war operations. The imposing irony is that in any hot war we wouldn't think twice about establishing a politico-psychological apparatus which is the same that is desperately needed in the present cold war. For reasons of survival, if not national goals of expanded freedom, the cold war gap must be closed. Foreign economic aid, military alliances, and our own adequate Military Establishment cannot in themselves cope with Moscow's cold war operations.

Of course, the present Russian totalitarians possess the wealth of centuries of experience in cold war methods and techniques. From the 16th century on, their predecessors built an unprecedented empire with these self-same techniques of subversion, infiltration, conspiracy, blackmail, and divide and conquer. There isn't a century for which cases cannot be given of the skillful use of these methods. Lenin learned these from the history of the empire, not from Marx or Engels. Being a true Leninist, Khrushchev exploits the fake philosophy of communism as a cold war instrument in the same way that the previous czars manipulated the equally fake philosophies of Russian Orthodox supremacy and pan-Slavicism. Also true to tradition, he bellows noninterference as concerns free interest in his captives just as his forebears had done in connection with their enslaved nations. Interference, in the Russian view, is only a one-way street outside the empire. The czars were also masters in instigating anti-Jewish agitation to discredit legitimate movements and institutions: Czar Nikita shows equal mastery in dipping into the sewers of prejudice to accomplish similar ends.

These and more are not just academic historical parallels. The past lives very much in the present. Khrushchev himself attests to this. Only last month, in Budapest, he compared himself with Czar Nicholas I who helped put down the Hungarian Revolution in 1848. Had we been prepared for the glorious opportunity provided by the Hungarian Revolution of 1956—and without involving our own forces—he wouldn't have had this chance to compare himself with a previous czar. Khrushchev today is playing a triadic role: like Nicholas, he is seeking Western consent and acquiescence toward his empire; like Lenin, he is advancing the ideas of nationalism, anticolonialism, and anti-imperialism in Asia and Africa; like Stalin, he is holding firm to the totalitarian reins, accomplishing even more adroitly police state measures which Stalin handled crudely.

Khrushchev may have this wealth of experience in cold war operations, but we have to our enormous advantage the most fertile field for cold war application. To make use of this field in the interest of our own freedom, as well as others, necessitates the overcoming of a serious intellectual gap in our knowledge and understanding of the Soviet Union.

#### THE INTELLECTUAL GAP RE U.S.S.R.

When I authored the Captive Nations Week resolution last year, little did I anticipate that its able sponsorship and passage in our Congress would provoke Khrushchev to think that this intellectual gap in our country has been spontaneously closed. His actions showed that he fears this deeply, and with good reason. Once this gap is filled, in our eyes and the eyes of the free world, Russia will dwindle to proper size. Russian propaganda, which exaggerates the Potemkin Village achievements of science, technology, economics, and education in the U.S.S.R., would suffer irreparable losses. Our added knowledge, understanding, and perception of the Soviet Union, if skillfully used, could render Moscow indefinitely insecure within the Soviet Union itself. They would eliminate, too, many of our baseless fears.

It is not a stroke of superpatriotic rhetoric to declare that, on the basis of projected current trends, easily within the next 50 years no nation could be compared in total power and capability with the United States. The Soviet Union, factually and historically, is not a nation. In addition to Russia and its approximately 96 million people, the Soviet Union consists of many non-Russian nations which, significantly, make up the majority of captive nations in the entire Red Empire. One of them, Ukraine, with its 40 million people, is the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain. Moscow has its internal satellites as well as its external ones. If the external ones, like Poland and Hungary, are deemed unreliable for Moscow's global purposes, the record of the past 38 years shows that the internal satellites, like Ukraine and Turkestan, are equally unreliable. Without the rich captive resources of these internal satellites, Russia would be a power no greater than an integrated Germany. Most of us are even unaware of the fact that about 35 million Moslems, many with strong ties with Turkey and Pakistan, are held captive in this primary empire of Moscow.

Give some thought to these fundamental facts and what they signify. These facts are expressed in the Captive Nations Resolution and Khrushchev recognized well their significance and their portent. Unfortunately, many of us still don't. Our economic and military comparisons are drawn on the basis of false and misleading concepts and definitions. There is no more a gross national product in the Soviet Union than there is a gross global product here. A gross imperial product, with phonetic emphasis upon the *gip*, is truer to fact. We approach a far more accurate and different picture of relative economic strength by only comparing the total output of Moscow's entire empire, which includes mainland China, with that of the free world alliances. The difference is staggering. Comparing the United States, which is a Nation, with the Soviet Union, which is an empire of many subjugated nations, cannot suit Moscow's propaganda mill better. It conceals all the facts of economic colonialism within the U.S.S.R. itself.

For the same basic reasons, our military comparisons are askewed. If we deem the armed forces of the external satellites as being unreliable for Moscow, there are firm grounds for a similar evaluation of the armed forces in the U.S.S.R. About 45 percent of these forces consist of captive

non-Russians, and these, by basic policy, are largely dispersed from their respective homelands in this substrate empire. Our memories are short, and our perspectives are narrow. Only in the past World War, millions of these non-Russians deserted to take up arms against Moscow. In the Hungarian revolution, Ukrainians, Russians, and others joined with the Hungarian patriots. In Napoleonic times, Alexander I threatened Europe with his armed might; before World War I, Czar Nicholas II scared Europe with the steamroller, his imperial armed forces; and now Czar Nikita engages in nuclear blackmail. In three major wars in this century, the multi-national forces controlled by Moscow disintegrated early in the deadly game. On the basis of these facts and more, one can understand why at the end of the recent 2-day session of the Supreme Soviet, the delegates were whisked away to see a performance of Tolstoy's "War and Peace." Their self-assuring theme song was that "no conqueror will ever again march through Moscow." Contrary to popular myth, both Napoleon and Hitler were defeated not by the empire's forces but by the emptiness of their ideologies. Both had nothing but continued slavery to offer to the Russians and non-Russian nations in Moscow's empire.

We, of course, seek to conquer no one. But we richly possess an ideology which emphasizes that freedom is indivisible. And in the permanent cold war it is the deadliest weapon against Moscow's totalitarian empire, the Soviet Union. Terms like "the Soviets," "the Soviet people," "the Soviet nation," or Russia as an equivalent for U.S.S.R. are marks of our intellectual lag regarding this basic empire. This lag is shown, too, by the fact that nowhere in our Government is there any continuous study made of the sensitive relations between Moscow and its internal satellites. Our ignorance along this fundamental line is appalling. We're like a football team facing an opponent without the advantage of a scout's briefing on his basic weaknesses. You wouldn't believe it, but 2 years ago an obtuse attempt was made to eliminate the non-Russian languages beamed by our Voice of America to the U.S.S.R. Thanks to a few alert Congressmen, the peoples there were spared listening to our programs in the language of their Russian captor.

#### THE WILL FOR FREEDOM

Now, finally, the why of our position on peace with honor. Principles and know-how are mute without the human will to enforce them. Our will for freedom is not just an emotion; it is a certitude, a vision with a rational outlook. On the basis of our principles and the capabilities set by our know-how, this will works creatively to mould that world order allowing for the free and maximum fruition of individual and national potentialities. Our conception of world order, based on rights and law, is the very negation of Moscow's colonial and imperialist totalitarianism. This will for freedom creates, not just preserves; it moves forward, not just rests; it is determined to see things through on the time-honored principle that the best defense is the offense. We are so growth-conscious today about our economy, foreign trade, the underdeveloped countries, space exploration and other fields: the one area we should be most growth-conscious about is the state of world freedom.

In this eventful year, you and your organizations can do much to further this will for freedom:

1. The year 1960 is a Lincolnian year, the centennial of a Presidency whose immortal words on the impossibility of half free and half slave applies on a global basis today. The year 1976 will be the 200th anniversary of our Declaration of Independence for which we should prepare with clean consciences and firm hearts. Instead of long-run economic plans, let us initiate in the

spirit of our living revolution a 16-year freedom plan for spiritual reeducation and a politico-psychological force that would stir the hearts and minds of people throughout the world;

2. More than anything else, Khrushchev wants our acquiescence and consent to the permanent captivity of the over 20 nations in his vast empire. His sputniks, luniks, and missileniks are all diversionary means for attaining this crucial objective. Unless we are bent upon suicide, this we could never allow to happen. In terms of our principles, not to say national strategy, such an accommodation is unthinkable. Your organizations can give full expression to this by preparing now for the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week this July;

3. The record shows that all recent summits have resulted in grave disadvantages for us. Two years of clever propaganda by Moscow has sucked us into another summit and perhaps a series of diversionary talks. Even now Khrushchev is reviving pressure on West Berlin. You and I can urge our President that the summit agenda include the basic issues of the captive nations and an integrated Germany and that our stand on West Berlin, which is only the tail of these issues, be firm and uncompromising. Before long we shall learn that the only self-respecting way to treat a totalitarian Russian is by firmness and confident resolve;

4. To close the serious cold war gap, your organizations can help immensely in this by supporting the important bills in Congress (H.R. 3880 and S. 1689) proposing the creation of a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy; and

5. We are constantly told to learn about and understand other peoples and nations. By all means. From the viewpoint of our own national security, I believe you will agree that a working knowledge and understanding of the many non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. ranks high in priority. You can develop this important interest which basically is in the interest of our own national security.

By doing what you believe in is the true exercise of the will for freedom. Our will for freedom is the backbone of the will to freedom among the enslaved. This will is at the core of peace with honor. This will is ably represented by you.

Mr. Speaker, along with many other Members of Congress, it has been my happy privilege to become an honorary member of this committee. This national committee of over 250 prominent Americans represents every major sphere of our society—labor, management, education, the press, fraternals, the entertainment world. The committee's preparations for Captive Nations Week were extensive and impressive. It stimulated the formation of local committees in about 50 major communities throughout the country.

It is not possible for me here to present all the evidences of this preparation, but the following selected items are sufficient to give an indication of the work of this committee. I include at this point the prayers printed in the colorful brochure, "Captive Nations Week, July 17-23, 1960," prepared and distributed in tens of thousands of copies. Dr. Alexis Carrel, a famous scientist, once said:

The most powerful form of energy that one can generate is prayer. Only in prayer do we achieve that complete and harmonious assembly of body, mind, and spirit, which gives the frail human need its unshakable strength.

Khrushchev scoffs at this because he fears it. Through such energy the committee released a letter to the President prior to the summit, statements on "The Summit Debate" and "Nekulturniy Khrushchev," and on the eve of the observance letters to our newspaper organs, which also I include as part of my remarks:

#### PRAYERS FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS

O, Lord, the Blessed One, through Thy blessings and Thy unique compassions, succor all the human beings who are suffering under the oppression of the tyrannic and brutal acts of imperialist totalitarianism.

May they have the opportunity to enjoy their freedom and liberty, for they were equally created: may we, with courage and strength, always work to magnify this opportunity. (Prepared May 1960 by Geshe Wangyal, graduate of Buddhist Seminary, Tibet.)

Our Father God, Author of liberty, grateful for our own freedom we lift our prayer for the millions of God-fearing people—Thy children, who look up to Thee crying "how long, O Lord, how long," even as they are bound with the chords of a temporary tyranny.

In this desperate hour when the world's hope for a brighter tomorrow is so largely committed to our frail hands, strengthen us in Thy name to challenge all evil forces which deal in fetters of the body and mind and which seek to degrade human personality.

Without ceasing we would remember the captive nations in their cruel bondage—proud peoples with their precious traditions stamped into the dust while alien Caesars exercise their ruthless sway over them. Above all the tumult and shouting of these volcanic days we hear the summons of Thy voice as in centuries past. "Let my people go."

May we play our full part in the restoration of human rights everywhere. May no denial of human freedom by those who would crush the liberties of others contaminate our souls with the blight of expediency. Strengthen us with Thy might that the arrogant boasts of entrenched tyranny may but put steel into our purpose to break their grip upon the governments and lives they now enslave.

We thank Thee for the inner shrine in human hearts which no dictator can desecrate, and where blaze the candles of faith which no iron fists can snuff out.

Give us to see that to acquiesce in the crucifixion of freedom anywhere is ultimately to nail our own liberty on the same cross, knowing that with what measure we mete, it shall be measured to us again.

We ask it in the Name of the Redeemer who came to proclaim liberty to the captives and deliverance to those who are bound. Amen. (Prepared May 1960 by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate.)

O Almighty Creator, who has endowed every human being with the power of free choice, hear the cries of Thy children from whom this precious birthright has been stolen. In this day when whole nations groan under the yoke of godless oppression, let those countless martyrs who have willingly shed their blood for Thee give testimony of their desire for the blessings of liberty.

O God of our Fathers, once Thy Chosen People begged Thee for deliverance from captivity in the Land of Egypt, and Thou didst take pity on them. Show forth Thy power today and lead from bondage the millions of Thy people enslaved by men who revile Thy very name.

O God of Wisdom, whose beloved Son has said, "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," let the light of Thy divine truth penetrate the hearts of



those who hate and persecute Thy people. Only Thy truth can bring that peace which the human race has ever sought—not merely the absence of armed conflict, but peace based on justice and freedom for every human creature.

O God of Mercy, regard not our unworthiness, for we do not pray for ourselves—but for the unknown millions who are suffering in silence for love of Thee. For their sake, O Lord, we earnestly beg Thee to hasten the coming of Thy reign of peace. Amen. (Prepared May 1960 by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John B. Roeder, vice chancellor, archdiocese of Washington, D.C.)

O Thou who are the peace of the world: Save our generation from the terror that cometh by night and the arrow that flieth by day; from the pestilence that walketh in darkness and its destruction that wasteth at noonday:

O Thou who hast led us across the Red Seas and the wilderness of the yesteryears in a vision of a divine covenant; quicken that vision in our minds so that with renewed faith we shall be its living witness and inspire free men toward a rebirth of freedom to face the promise of a new age:

O Thou who hast been our refuge and our fortress through the ages, our altar of devotion, light our lives with Thy sacred fire and our hearts with Thy flame so that with strength of spirit and courage of purpose we will strive toward a world bringing Thy light and Thy peace unto the children of men.

Bless Thou the men who raise the standards of Thy law in our own time; the men who are not neutral in time of evil nor turn their face when the wicked would barter the birthright of freedom for a mess of red potage; the men who would rise to new sacrifice so that the captives will be freed and the age of a free church in a free state shall come for all Thy children;

Guide us and guard us and lead us forward so that through our labors in this moment of history we shall be the witness of Thy covenant and the time will soon come when the world shall be filled with the knowledge of a righteous God even as the waters cover the seas. (Prepared May 1960 by Dr. Norman Gerstenfeld, rabbi, Washington, D.C., congregation.)

MAY 12, 1960.

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On the eve of your departure for the summit meeting in Paris, I wish to take this opportunity to express the one central idea which binds the rapidly growing membership of this national committee, namely that in the light of our traditions and our moral leadership among the nontotalitarian nations of the free world it is unthinkable that we should fail to press the fundamental issue of the captive nations—those within as well as those outside the Soviet Union—as a paramount subject of summit discussion. Indeed, the U-2 incident and Moscow's distorting propaganda abuse of it necessitate that at long last we face the reality of all the captive nations, not just the minority of them in Central Europe.

In accord with the written intent of Public Law 86-90 enacted last year, this committee is a natural response to the reasoned convictions and judgments of countless American citizens who properly view the captive nations issue as a subject of cold logic and national strategy, not just one of warm sentiment and humanitarian concern. The surging, nationwide support for Captive Nations Week observance is impressive evidence that the rank and file of the American people view with abhorrence the slavery status of whole nations, the result of Moscow's imperialist totalitarianism. Our American people, thank God, are not reconciled to the captivity of millions by Red

totalitarian tyrants, nor do we regard this as their permanent condition. We thus urge you, Mr. President, to expressly convey at the summit both the spirit and the contents of the captive nations resolution which our Congress passed last year.

Developments of the past 3 years, highlighted by sputniks and other basically diversionary Russian performances, cannot but cause us to recall here the apt words of Karl Marx—words which still are unquotable in Khrushchev's supposedly relaxed empire:

"They will have learned before that the idea of Russian diplomatic supremacy owes its efficiency to the imbecility and the timidity of the Western nations, and that the belief in Russia's superior military power is hardly less a delusion. There is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the fearless way."

Applied to the current scene, this is doubtlessly a strong statement and, in part, exaggerated. But when one faces the paramount fact that, in this past century, of all the major colonial empires the Russian one was not only able to survive but also, behind the legalistic mask of the U.S.S.R., now even threatens the security of the nontotalitarian world, the aptness of the statement could scarcely be denied. It is most significant that this observation was made during the reign of Czar Nicholas I with whom Khrushchev now openly compares himself, as witness his Budapest address last December. With secrecy and espionage in the air today, we can all profit by reading the illuminating chapter on "The Secret Life of Russia" in Marquis de Custine's classic "Journey for Our Time," a work written in the days of Khrushchev's present model and about whom the author says: "when I gaze upon this personage, unique in the world, from close at hand, I believe his head has two faces, like that of Janus" (p. 215).

The cold war techniques of Khrushchev who has clearly earned the imperial title of Nikita the Surly, are essentially those of Nicholas I, the former and equally arrogant gendarme of Europe. Nuclear blackmail threats, exercises in Potemkin Village economics, and many other stratagems have their substantial precedents in the history of Russian empire building, written by the blood of both the oppressed Russian and non-Russian peoples. The peace-at-no-price attitude shown by Moscow toward the summit indicates in itself the manner by which it seeks to exploit this given opportunity. Its propaganda machine has even gone to the length of attempting to compromise the position of Western Germany by unjust attacks upon Theodore Oberlander, the Refugee Minister of our ally, in whose defense scores of witnesses in this country could be supplied. Its propaganda exploitation of the U-2 incident, which may well backfire, is more generally known. In short, Moscow's carefully calculated game of bluff and bluster has reaped for it another summit: its aim now is to exploit it fully.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the irony of the current situation lies in the overall fact that Moscow is able to advance diplomatically and propagandawise though it is really operating from basic weaknesses and multiformed necessity. Our memories are short. All evidence shows that at the time of the Hungarian Revolution the Red totalitarian empire was in grave trouble. Surely the passage of 4 years has not erased the inherent weaknesses in the structure of this far-flung empire. Plainly, a ruler secure in his empire would certainly not erupt as Khrushchev had upon the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution last year. Out of necessity and the need for time to consolidate, Moscow is clearly pressing for Western accommodation to its empire under the spurious label of "peaceful coexistence," along with the hope that its calculated propaganda of bluff and bluster may twist

any indication of Western timidity into real concessions.

Unleashing Marx at Khrushchev, our actions should be completely guided by the historical truth that "there is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the fearless way." Disarmament, nuclear test bans, the misnamed topic of East-West relations, involving trade and cultural exchange, are in reality secondary issues. Khrushchev's overriding objective is free world assent and acquiescence to his empire. His emphasis upon disarmament and other subsidiary issues is designed to deflect our attention from the basic issue. The omission of this subject in summit discussion will certainly be propagandistically exploited in the empire to mislead the captives that the free world's interest in them has waned.

This committee, therefore, strongly urges that our Government seize every opportunity to insist upon this crucial subject as a major point of summit discussion. Failure to do so would be, in effect, an accommodation to Moscow's empire and a victory for Khrushchev, far surpassing anything his unreliable multinational military forces could achieve. We would be bolstering the security of his totalitarian, colonial system and undermining one of our most powerful deterrents against overt totalitarian aggression and a hot war, namely, the captive nations both within and outside the Soviet Union. The very implication of an assent to the status quo would make mockery of the Captive Nations Week resolution and also of the proclamation issued by you, Mr. President, last year. In terms of bargaining position, the captive nations are of enormous and strategic value to the security of the nontotalitarian world. Any rationalization to the effect that this fundamental subject might be discussed later in a possible series of summits would not mitigate some of the above effects.

This summit is truly a ripe occasion for the expression of our initiative, diplomatic offensive, and asserted knowledgeability as concerns Moscow's empire, which includes the Soviet Union itself. At every point we could express these qualities and place Moscow on a retreating defensive. The U-2 incident has revived the open skies plan and the need for breaking through the Iron Curtain. We could also point out that most of the territory flown over by the plane is captive non-Russian and forthrightly bring into question the legitimacy of Moscow's argument on international law. A law which in truth and history is not founded upon the inalienable rights of people is hardly one commanding of dutiful observance. We earnestly hope that after all that has been sensationally revealed by this incident, our Government will manifest at the summit that power of fearless initiative without which the unending challenge of Moscow's imperialist totalitarianism cannot be met.

With God's many blessings upon your historic venture and best wishes in our firm policy of justice and freedom for peace and friendship among all nations, including those in the Soviet Union, I am

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,  
Chairman.

#### THE SUMMIT DEBACLE: A LESSON AND AN OPPORTUNITY

MAY 18, 1960.—The firm and honorable position taken by our President with regard to Khrushchev's arrogant demands at the summit warrants the praise and admiration of every American. The National Captive Nations Week Committee, made up of citizens dedicated to the spirit, principles, and content of the Captive Nations Week resolution, proudly lauds the President's forthright rejection of the Red czar's ultimatum. The President monumentalizes our stand of no Munich with Moscow's totalitarians.

The collapse of this summit should at long last signalize for all sober-thinking Americans the basic need to face up to the realities of the incessant cold war. Taking a leaf from Russia's imperialist history, the cold war will exist so long as captive non-Russian nations exist, both within and without the Soviet Union, and the Russian people themselves are kept in totalitarian bondage. It is a pity that our President had to be subjected to the indignities of an ill-bred leader who in the captive world has the fixed reputation as the "Hangman of Ukraine" and the "Butcher of Budapest." But perhaps this event will serve as a lesson to the many naive elements in our country who pressed these past 2 years for a deal with Red imperialist totalitarianism.

Khrushchev's insulting behavior was a calculated part of the zigzag cold war game played by Moscow, a game designed to undermine the resistance of freemen. Contrary to obtuse statements that the cold war will now be resumed, the stubborn fact is that the summit itself was an instrument of Moscow's cold war game. The cold war is merely in a state of continuation. It is fervently hoped that by this acid experience we will now begin to recognize the dire need for preparing and seizing the opportunities open to us for victory in this protracted conflict. Moscow's brand of peaceful coexistence or a hot war is certainly not the only choice before us.

The blustering Khrushchev statement on the opening day more than confirms the contents of our memorandum delivered to the White House last week. His statement and timed behavior provided the third phase in the summit development since November 1957: first he pressured for it; then, long before the grossly exaggerated U-2 incident, he arrogantly propagandized against free world interests; and now he brazenly prostituted the organs of international diplomacy by his design to humiliate the spokesman of the leading power in the nontotalitarian free world.

As we stressed in our memorandum last week, Khrushchev is operating from a position of weakness, not one of strength. All his bluster about military power, retaliation, space satellites and rockets—of secondary and tertiary importance in themselves—cannot conceal the deep, inherent weakness of his empire, which necessarily includes the numerous captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Khrushchev's statement at the summit is in reality a statement of self-indictment. It attains to the same summit of diabolical fraudulence as his atheistic appeal to God as his witness. The entire statement is girded to the spurious sovereignty of the Soviet state, standards of international law, and the lofty principles of the United Nations Charter. It even alludes to the Soviet Union as being a nation.

The premises of this statement should not go without challenge at this time. The whole issue of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. is tied up with these premises. Our diplomacy of truth should be pursued to lay before the world the full truth of all the captive nations. On the basis of historical fact and truth there is no need to apologize for the U-2 incident. Most of the territory flown over, namely Turkestan, is captive non-Russian territory anyway. Clearly, in point of logic, if before the summit it was a distasteful necessity to conduct aerial reconnaissance over this non-Russian territory and the fringe of the territory of the Siberians, it is no less now. The promotion of an open society plan is only another way of calling for the emancipation of the captive nations. We should press for this now, with pointed concentration on the captive nations within the Soviet Union. We would be building up further one of our greatest deterrents against a hot war and, with truth as our weapon, defeating Moscow's cold war

challenge. Needless to say, Moscow could ill afford a hot war with a progressively insecure empire. How frightened Moscow is by this prospect was plainly shown last July when the captive nations resolution was passed. Its three major wars in this century clearly demonstrate that even improved military technology cannot possibly overcome the basic forces of nationalism and human freedom. In all three, its military forces disintegrated early.

Khrushchev likes to compare himself with the equally arrogant Czar Nicholas I, the gendarme of Europe. For our time we cannot but quote again the apt remarks made by Karl Marx in Nicholas' time: "There is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the fearless way." A persistent campaign of truth about Moscow's empire—its economic colonialism, militaristic imperialism, and barbaric totalitarianism—would be enough to cage even a raving bear with a club.

#### NEKULTURNYI KHRUSHCHEV

It is nothing short of amazing that in all the verbal furor over the U-2 incident and the summit, two fundamental facts are completely ignored. Indeed, a persistent oversight of these two basic and determining facts hardly speaks well for those who today are most vocal on the issue.

The first clear fact is that the U-2 plane flew over mostly captive non-Russian territory in the U.S.S.R., specifically that of Turkestan, as well as over a fringe of the area occupied by decentralist Siberians. From the viewpoints of geography, history, and demography, Russian territory as such was not even involved in this incident. Unless we subscribe to the notion of sovereignty based on conquest and colonial domination by totalitarian Moscow (and many in this country unwarily seem to), this essential fact should forthrightly be put before the American people.

Curiously enough, when Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution last year, it rightly manifested to the world its solid understanding of the captive status of Turkestan and parts of Siberia. If we are truly dedicated to a diplomacy of truth, the time is now to bring into full question the fictitious sovereignty and hollow standards of international law which imperialist Moscow exploits to conceal its more basic empire from the world. An open debate grounded in essential fact and truth would be most salutary at this time.

The second notable fact which eludes the understanding of many in this country is the full and open exposure of the Nekulturny Khrushchev (the uncultured Khrushchev) at the summit. Note is taken, to be sure, of his uncouth, boisterous and arrogant behavior, but these are only symptoms of his essentially uncultured character. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the effects of this exposure are felt in the hearts and minds of the Russian intelligentsia itself.

Khrushchev pretends to represent the Soviet people. He, of course, does not represent the captive non-Russian nations and peoples in the U.S.S.R. His reputation among them is that of the hangman of the Ukraine and the butcher of Hungary. But also vitally important is the fact that Nekulturny Khrushchev does not represent the culture and intellectual attainments of the Russian nation itself. Against the rich background of Russian culture and civilization the barbaric behavior of Nekulturny Khrushchev at Paris is unquestionably an ineradicable blot in the pages of Russian history. Without doubt, this barbaric spectacle has brought nothing but disgust and shame to the minds and hearts of the present Russian intelligentsia.

Whereas the Russian intelligentsia cannot express itself on this score, we as a free

people can do it for them. Khrushchev clearly established his reputation at Paris as Nekulturny Nikita. This appropriate nomen, Nekulturny (ne-kool-toor'ny) Nikita or Khrushchev, deserves to be heard throughout the nontotalitarian free world. Its general use would provide that free expression to the disgust and nausea that now dwells in the minds and hearts of cultured Russians.

#### A LETTER TO THE EDITOR

JULY 12, 1960.

EDITOR,  
*Washington Post and Times Herald,*  
Washington, D.C.:

Captive Nations Week will be observed on July 17-23. In accordance with Public Law 86-90, the National Captive Nations Week Committee was founded to prepare this observance. In most major cities, local committees have been formed to conduct the activities of this significant observance.

In view of the world developments this past year, the urgency of recognizing the strategic importance of all the captive nations to U.S. interests in the cold war cannot be too strongly emphasized. It will be recalled that when Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution last July, followed by the President's proclamation, Nekulturny (uncultured) Khrushchev broke into a wild rage. There was good reason for this violent reaction. The resolution for the first time struck at the tenuous bases of Moscow's propaganda pretensions and claims by which it seeks to deceive and influence minds throughout the free world.

Unfortunately, the meaning of the resolution and Moscow's reaction to it were not fully understood by some of our observers. Your editorial then "Irritating the Bear," July 24, 1959, essentially held that we must not confront the sprawling bear with the club of truth. In the recent light of Paris, Tokyo, Italy, Cuba, and elsewhere, we earnestly hope you and others will now understand our position.

Our observance of Captive Nations Week expresses these convictions: (1) That the chief struggle is not in the nuclear and military field but in the overall propaganda and psycho-political; (2) that the only way to prevent a hot global war is to win the psychological cold war by the prime ideology of the freedom of all the captive nations; (3) that our Declaration of Independence, wisely externalized, provides the moral and political truths—as well as unsurpassable national purposes—to cage the Bear; (4) that the myth of Soviet unity and power must be exploded so that the entire world may see what the Soviet Union really is, a loosely knitted quilt of captive nations where economic colonialism and political imperialism are rampant; and (5) that by a firm and unwavering policy of emancipation and independence aimed at all the captive nations, including those in the U.S.S.R., we can best aid the Russian people to attain their independence from centuries of political barbarism.

Toward these ends and dynamic, programmatic action, we urge (a) the establishment of a permanent Congressional Committee on Captive Nations, (b) the creation of an executive agency on the self-determination of captive and occupied nations, (c) the institution of a freedom academy, and (d) the adoption of a policy of emancipation and independence. We call for a 16-year freedom plan, commencing with this anniversary Lincolnian year of the Great Emancipator and earning the honor of our being as the nation of world freedom by 1976, the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

In the year of one of Khrushchev's favorite predecessors, Marx wrote: "They will have learned before that the idea of Russian diplomatic supremacy owes its efficiency



to the imbecility and the timidity of the Western nations, and that the belief in Russia's superior military power is hardly less a delusion. There is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the fearless way." We're not imbecile or timid, but some are deluded and we have yet to take the fearless way.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,  
Chairman, National Captive Nations  
Week Committee and Author of  
Captive Nations Week Resolution.

NATIONWIDE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK  
OBSERVANCE

Mr. Speaker, due to the tireless efforts of the National Captive Nations Committee and those of the many local committees, millions of Americans participated in the 1960 observance of Captive Nations Week. At my request, the committee has furnished me hundreds of newspaper clippings reporting the activities of this nationwide observance. Every section of the country is represented. Editorials and reports appeared in the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, the New York Daily News, the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Daily Times of Maine, the Saturday Democrat of Massachusetts, the Sentinel of South Carolina, the Eastern Colorado Plainsmen, the Sacramento Union of California, and many others, large and small, from almost every State of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, to show the range and types of these reports on the observance activities throughout the Nation, I present the following selected items which I include as part of my remarks:

[From the Washington Star, July 24, 1960]  
SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—LET MY PEOPLE GO  
(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

The test of America's boasted freedom is how much her free men care for those who have lost their liberty. To revel only in one's freedom, and to forget the fetters of others, is a base betrayal of our own heritage. Such forgetfulness is an ominous prophecy that those who do not fight for liberty everywhere will finally lose their own. There is absolutely no question more vital in this day of besieging problems than the attitude of the free nations toward the lands Soviet Russia has bound with the shackles of serfdom.

There is nothing on which the conspirators of the Kremlin are more adamant than their insistence that their imperialistic robberies be recognized and the status of satellite nations be accepted as final. That assumption is a definite part of their strategy to communalize the whole earth. They have the effrontery to suggest to the free world that they agree to coexistence with those who are using every foul force to stamp out the fire of freedom in lands once free but now under the Soviet's savage sway.

The greatest imperialists of the age so discount the intelligence of the human race and so distort the facts that they now charge the very Republic which gave Cuba its freedom with plotting its enslavement. The system with millions of slaves in its iron hold threatens to "free" Cuba. Could the big lie be stretched to bigger proportions?

It is an appeal to the best instincts of America which sounds in the call of Congress and of the President for a specific week of remembering the captive nations whose anguished cry, "How long, O Lord, how long?" must never be drowned by the glorification of our own freedom. Nothing which he heard in our free land aroused the ire of the crude and cruel peasant who

stands at the top of the Soviet pyramid of brute strength as much as any reference to Hungary, and the other captive nations.

No wonder, for it is the one heinous blot that gives the lie to all the fair promises of this vast principality of evil which has invented its own inverted and perverted dictionary in which the holy word "peace" means simply the victory of their tyranny.

Captive Nations Week serves notice on the Kremlin that no rocket-rattling will ever make America forget her vow to keep alive the knowledge of atrocities perpetrated, until the submerged nations are rescued from the invader and their soil no longer defiled by this abomination.

Our Congress has called the roll of those now under the Soviet yoke: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, North Korea, Albania, Tibet, and others. To make sure that the idea of Captive Nations Week does not prove to be simply an ephemeral sop to the American conscience, Congress specifically declares that "the President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world." With wholehearted approval President Eisenhower sounds a trumpet which must never know retreat in his ringing words, "There can be no true peace which involves acceptance of the status quo in which we find injustice to many nations and repression of human beings on a gigantic scale."

And what does all this have to do with "Spires?" Everything. It is under the church spires of America that there thunders the emancipating words of the Father God, to whom all souls belong and to whom all souls are dear, "Let My people go."

Every remembrance of the captive nations is a prayer. Their plight ought to be the subject of prayer in every temple of worship on the Sunday of the annual Captive Nations Week.

We can imagine no more moving scene in any church in America than the service at 11 a.m. on the dear Lord's blessed day of that week observed at St. Patrick's Catholic Church in the Capital of free America. Present were many whose ancestral roots are in the nations now enslaved. Many of them had fled from the present tyranny. From the high white pulpit of that lovely sanctuary Bishop Philip M. Hannan proclaimed the unvarnished truth in sermon and in prayer. His was indeed the voice of America, and the voice of the Universal Church as to the altar of the Most High the shackled millions were lifted in the arms of Christian sympathy and intercession.

In such an hour of worship in any church we are reminded of the final judgment test of the Master who came preaching release for the captives as He asks the piercing question, "When I was in prison did you come unto Me?"

In the spirit of that moving service in St. Patrick's, let us pray—Our Father God, author of liberty, without ceasing we would remember the captive nations in their cruel bondage—proud peoples with their precious traditions stamped into the dust while alien Caesars exercise their ruthless sway over them. Above all the tumult and shouting of these volcanic days we hear Thy summons, even as in centuries past, "Let My people go." Give us to see that to acquiesce in the crucifixion of freedom anywhere is ultimately to nail our liberty on the same cross, knowing that with what measure we mete, it shall be measured to us again. We ask it in the Name of the Redeemer who came to proclaim liberty to the captives and deliverance to those who are bound. Amen.

[From the Washington Star, Aug. 7, 1960]

COMMENDS DR. HARRIS

For some time now both my wife and I have been consistent readers of the "Spires of the Spirit" column written by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris in the Sunday Star. To us it has come to be a weekly must. And on the basis of my various associations I know that this expressed admiration for the column also reflects the thoughts and feelings of countless other readers.

I sincerely congratulate the Star for making the writings of the Chaplain of the U.S. Senate accessible to us. In his own right Dr. Harris is widely respected in many quarters of the globe for his remarkable capacity to interpret the temporal and ephemeral in terms of the eternal and universally necessary. His lucidly written column furnishes us with perspectives and insights which are not readily obtainable elsewhere. The manner in which he invariably weds principle and act, the moral idea and the experiential empiric, illuminates the meaning and significance of every current development he treats.

His recent article "Let My People Go" clearly substantiates these points. In behalf of all our citizens who observed Captive Nations Week, I wish to express publicly our gratitude and esteem for this superb literary rendition which will be widely distributed next year. Indeed, Dr. Harris presented the facts about the 22 captive nations with impressive accuracy. His column is a source of powerful spiritual sustenance for all its readers.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,  
Chairman, National Committee on  
Captive Nations Week.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 17, 1960]  
WHY YOU PRAY TODAY FOR 22 CAPTIVES—DR.  
DOBRIANSKY HAS AROUSED WORLD TO FLIGHT  
OF ENSLAVED

(By William Gill)

Because of the perseverance of one man, thousands of people here and in the rest of the United States will kneel today in prayer for the liberation of 22 nations held captive by the Kremlin.

He is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, 41, a balding, scholarly professor of Soviet Economics at Georgetown University in Washington.

A lieutenant-colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve, Dr. Dobriansky was teaching at the National War College when he conceived the idea for Captive Nations Week which starts today.

The year was 1958 and the United States, having failed to act in the Hungarian Revolt 2 years earlier, had all but buried its avowed policy of liberation of the captive peoples of Eastern Europe and Asia.

"Then, as now, I was increasingly concerned over the growing indifference in many American circles toward not only the status but also the strategic value of the captive nations," Dr. Dobriansky says.

New York-born, Dr. Dobriansky graduated magna cum laude from New York University, studied philosophy 7 years at Fordham and returned to New York University to earn his Ph. D. in political science in 1950. He is of Ukrainian heritage and is chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Dr. Dobriansky views Nikita Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence as a sinister drive to break the wills of the captive nations by convincing the United States it is hopeless to encourage the spirit of freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

This, he claims, would amount to an American guarantee of the territorial integrity of the Russian Empire. Secure in this knowledge, the Kremlin could then step up its cold-war operations far beyond their present scope.

Washington had all but officially granted this guarantee when Dr. Dobriansky saw his opportunity to head it off in June 1958.

The executions in Hungary of ex-Premier Imre Nagy and Gen. Pal Maleter spurred widespread anti-Communist demonstrations in the United States and Europe.

At this point Dr. Dobriansky got a resolution introduced in Congress calling for observance of a Captive Nations Week. The House Judiciary Committee killed it, largely because a majority felt a year was too long for such an observance.

Dr. Dobriansky had to wait another year before another event gave him a second chance. The event was Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's visit to Moscow last July. Many saw in this a first step toward granting the guarantee the Kremlin wants.

To allay these fears, Dr. Dobriansky again introduced his resolution, this time pruning the observance from a year down to 1 week—Captive Nations Week.

Cosponsored in the Senate by PAUL DOUGLAS, Illinois Democrat, and JACOB JAVITS, New York Republican, the resolution was unanimously passed by voice vote on July 6. Massachusetts' Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, House majority leader, hustled it through the lower Chamber.

The resolution did not mince words. It said that the "enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence."

It named the 22 nations Communist Russia holds in bondage, some of them nations Americans never thought of as independent entities because they had been conquered by the czars.

It sidestepped the promise of any direct U.S. action to set these nations free but it tied their continued resistance to America's own national security.

Finally, it urged the President to issue a proclamation setting aside Captive Nations Week to encourage this resistance.

Dr. Dobriansky claims the State Department is responsible for watering down the version signed by President Eisenhower last year. But this was barely noticed in the fireworks that followed.

Nikita Khrushchev squealed like a stuck pig. On the eve of Mr. Nixon's arrival in Moscow, he let loose a series of blasts at President Eisenhower for having the temerity to set aside a week of prayer for the captive nations.

Mr. Eisenhower returned the fire and he was backed up by leaders of both parties and most notably by George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO. Mr. Meany called Khrushchev's outbursts "only a demonstration of the inherent weakness of his sprawling slave empire."

In Moscow, Khrushchev got into a heated argument over the proclamation with Vice President Nixon as they toured the American exhibit.

Khrushchev's tirades did not deter Congress from passing the resolution again this year.

#### DOBRIANSKY ON RADIO THIS WEEK

Pittsburgh will have a chance to hear Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky on two local radio stations this week.

Today at 5:30 p.m. on WPIT, Dr. Dobriansky will take part in a Georgetown University Forum session titled "Moscow's Reaction to Captive Nations Week."

Tuesday at 9:05 p.m. on KDKA radio, Dr. Dobriansky will discuss the significance of the observance.

Justice Michael A. Musmanno, of the State supreme court, heads the Captive Nations Week observance in Pittsburgh and will speak tomorrow at a luncheon rally in the Roosevelt Hotel.

Other Pittsburghers on the national Captive Native Nations Committee include Bish-

op Nicholas T. Elko; Michael Komichak of the Ukrainian Congress Committee; Michael J. Vargovich of the Catholic Slovak Union, and Bozidar Vuckovic of the Croatian Fraternal Union.

#### [From the Lincoln (Ark.) Leader]

##### A TIME TO TAKE STOCK

As a result of long fumbling of our diplomacy, military intelligence, and economic relations around the globe, the United States is today in deadly peril of joining the captive nations. If we should collapse under the pressures our slop-happy policies have generated against us, we could no longer be of assistance—morally, spiritually, or financially—to any nation. And if we should collapse, the other presently free nations would go into Communist bondage along with us. The lamp of freedom would finally have been extinguished on this earth. And if Khrushchev should drink himself to death celebrating, it would be no help to us.

We might, therefore, in our Captive Nations Week observances find a place for emphasis on how not to become a captive nation—a review of our global blunders, say from Tehran to the U-2 and some suggestions for reform at this 11th hour. They may readily be found in BARRY GOLDWATER'S "Conscience of a Conservative."

Such emphasis might be of practical value in stiffening some political spines—in and out of Congress—especially as the week is more or less concurrent with the rising of the presidential campaign curtain in the drama (or tragedy) of the political titans searching for lollipop issues and policies that they hope we will all grab at.

#### [From the Arkansas Herald, July 18, 1960]

##### CAPTIVE NATIONS

We Americans, luxuriating in the lap of freedom, are now preoccupied with the business of choosing our national leaders. We nominate and vote for whomever we choose.

Whoever we elect will not control our lives. Our leaders are restricted to administering laws enacted under representative government.

Some 225 million people behind the Iron Curtain are not so fortunate. They are captives of a Communist hierarchy that has absolute power, enforced by police, to prescribe their every freedom.

To help these hapless fellow beings is the purpose of Captive Nations Week which began Sunday by joint resolution of the U.S. House and Senate.

By whatever means we can, each of us should do our bit to let these submerged nations know we are pulling for them. This is not only our moral obligation, but it serves our national interest.

Dissatisfaction of captive peoples constitutes a ball and chain on the Red masters. They are not free to do as they choose so long as a spark of revolt burns. Keeping the Communist leaders preoccupied with internal difficulties is one of the strongest deterrents to war.

At very least, each of us can pray this week for the well-being and ultimate delivery of our silent allies for freedom who are suffering at the hands of tyrants.

#### [From the Dallas News, July 17, 1960]

##### DALLAS MAYOR SETS CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Captive Nations Week in Dallas will be observed starting July 17, Mayor R. L. Thornton proclaimed Friday.

The week, commemorating the struggle for freedom by nations under Soviet domination, was approved by Congress on July 17, 1959.

"The third week in July will be designated with a similar proclamation until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world," said Mayor Thornton.

The proclamation pledges the "support of the Government and people of the United States for the many nations throughout the world made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism."

#### [From the St. Paul (Minn.) Wanderer, July 28, 1960]

##### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

When, in accordance with a law enacted by Congress, President Eisenhower last year proclaimed a Captive Nations Week, his action provoked a storm of Soviet denunciation. What? Captive nations? Ridiculous. Nowhere, the world was told by Moscow, do the bells of freedom peal more loudly than in happy Hungary, the joyously self-governing Baltic States, lighthearted Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Albania—all, of course, with a little friendly watchfulness on the part of the actual, or potential, presence of the Soviet Army.

President Eisenhower has again proclaimed a Captive Nations Week, again in accordance with a law of Congress and again inviting a torrent of abuse from Moscow.

Speeches and editorials attacking President Eisenhower were published simultaneously with glowing accounts of how the people of the Soviet Baltic Republics were celebrating in festive mood the 20th anniversary of the establishment of Soviet power.

The official newspapers of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government published greetings from the Kremlin leaders to the Communists chiefs in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

All through the past week huge rallies have been organized to "voice the joy over the liberation of these people from the bourgeois Fascist boot" so that they are now "free to march forward in the building of communism," it was declared.

The scathing sarcasm in which public utterances on the subject of the proclamation of Captive Nations Week was expressed was a clear sign of the indignation with which the Soviet leaders view such action.

The most vehement denunciation was an editorial in the Communist Party paper Pravda. It termed the action "just another insolent and stupid international provocation, spiced, moreover, with unpardonable lies."

Despite the Red anger, it is appropriate, and essential, that the West continues to assure these imprisoned people behind the Iron Curtain that they have not been forgotten. It is not its purpose to employ force to reestablish their independence. If independence is ever to be achieved it must be achieved by peaceful means. But we do not intend to forget the wrongs done to these small nations by an overpowering neighbor nor to abandon hope that the day will come when they will once more live in freedom.

#### [From the Catholic News, July 23, 1960]

##### MASS FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS OFFERED AT ST.

PATRICK'S—HIS EMINENCE MEETS REPRESENTATIVES OF 23 COMMUNIST-DOMINATED COUNTRIES AFTER MASS

Representatives of 23 Communist-dominated European and Asian countries, many in colorful national costumes, attended mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral on Sunday, July 17, to mark the opening of Captive Nations Week. Over 2,500 persons were in the congregation to mark the second year of such an observance, many recalling the resentment voiced over the institution of such a week by Premier Khrushchev last year when he complained bitterly to Vice President Nixon over the publicity given the inaugural meeting.

His eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman presided at the mass. The assistant priest to his eminence was the Right Reverend Monsignor Bela Varga, noted leader of the



Hungarians in exile and last president of the free Hungarian Parliament. Deacons of honor to his eminence were the Very Reverend Monsignor Jonas Balkunas, chairman of the Conference of Americans of Central-East European Descent and pastor of Transfiguration Church, Maspeth, and the Right Reverend Monsignor Stephen R. Krasula, pastor of St. John Nepomucene in Manhattan. The Right Reverend Monsignor Terence J. Cooke, vice chancellor of the archdiocese, was master of ceremonies to his eminence. The celebrant of the mass was the Very Reverend John A. Flynn, C.M., president of St. John's University.

The preacher of the occasion was the Right Reverend Monsignor John J. Dougherty, president of Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J. The text of Monsignor Dougherty's sermon was as follows:

"We have come together in this sacred place for a very serious purpose. We have come to this great cathedral not to be injected with 'the oil of the masses,' but to be inspired and strengthened by the mystery of the Mass. We have come to kneel in the majestic silence of this House of God to look with compassion on the suffering of our fellow man. Who are we? We are little men and women confronting history's largest and darkest hour. You are sons and daughters of many nations. Once free, now enslaved. We, who are Americans, join you, lest we forget the monstrous tyranny that has devoured your countries like a rampant bear. We have come to remember those that are enslaved, the captive nations, who sit 'in darkness and the shadow of death.' We have come to call upon God to remember them. We are here to pray in Christ's name and through His holy Mass, recalling His words of hope, 'You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.' We are here to examine our souls, to call to mind the responsibilities of free men, to weigh the cost of liberty.

"We begin today the observance of Captive Nations Week. This solemn religious service demonstrates the church's compassion for the enslaved peoples of the world, and manifests her longing that they be free. The church marshals the ranks of her children, arms them with the moral weapon of her most precious and powerful prayer, the holy Mass, and at the head of her spiritual forces pleads with God and men for the liberation of the captive nations. By this solemn service, and others like it, she proclaims to the world that she is the champion of the enslaved peoples and the eternal foe of the Communist ideology of their tyrannical masters. The church is confident that this unnatural ideology, so opposed to the nature of man and the God of nature, cannot endure. Her essential mission is to bring to man the blessings of personal spiritual and moral freedom through God's grace. She recognizes, however, man's elemental need for political, economic, civil, and religious freedom. She puts the weight of her spiritual authority and venerable dignity behind man's struggle for these freedoms.

"In this cathedral on this morning, her cry is once more hurled against the tyrant, 'let my people go.' The church has extended centuries of sympathy to the oppressed, since the day that her founder, standing in the synagogue at Nazareth, described His mission in the lines of the prophet Isaiah; among them were these words: 'To proclaim to the captives release.' The faith of the church is the hope of the captives, and the hope of the church is that their faith will support them till their freedoms come. Faith's freedom is a life that no tyrant can destroy, no secret police can root out, no concentration camp can starve out. By such freedom must captives live until their other freedoms are restored, and God will in His good time see to that.

"Captive Nation's Week is the challenge of this Nation flung at the tyrant's feet. The

resolution inaugurating it was passed by the Congress of the United States on July 9, 1959, and is now public law. It is a cry of protest against Communist tyranny that shall not be silenced 'until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved by all the captive nations of the world.' Since 1918 Russian communism has subjugated by direct and indirect aggression about 1 billion people, has deprived of national independence Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, the mainland of China, Armenia, North Korea, Albania, North Vietnam, Tibet, and other nations. It has founded its empire upon atheism, genocide, torture, slave labor, and Communist terror.

"That is why there is a Captive Nations Week.

"There is a Captive Nations Week because in the words of President Eisenhower's proclamation, 'Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties.' Because 'it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations of freedom and national independence,' because 'the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent.' There is a Captive Nations Week because in the words of the resolution of the Congress of the United States, 'the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples.'

"This undying cry of protest will reach the ears of the captive nations and kindle the ashes of their hope. It will reach the ears of the Kremlin masters and fill them with fury. Men who live by the lie are infuriated by the truth. But the cry must go on, until it becomes the shout heard around the world. Too long have we been silent, too long have we spoken with a soft voice. The captive nations are a fearful reminder that the alternative to nuclear war is not coexistence, but slavery.

"We are the hope of the captive nations, they look to us as the citadel of freedom. This is the destiny committed to us by history, and we must be worthy of it. This is our birthright and our glorious heritage. In the words of Woodrow Wilson:

"We in America have stood from the day of our birth for the emancipation of people throughout the world who were living unwillingly under governments which were not of their choice. The thing which we have held more sacred than any other is that all just government rests upon the consent of the governed."

"It was this philosophy that begot the Revolution of 1776, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

"It is not the philosophy that perpetrated the Bolshevik revolution of 1917. Today, we sons and heirs of the American Revolution, sons of Washington and Jefferson, confront the heirs of the Communist Revolution, the sons of Marx and Lenin, the Children of Cain. These two powers face each other like colossi that bestride the globe, two irreconcilable philosophies, the ideology of freedom and the ideology of slavery.

"Behind the Iron Curtain of one camp, the captive nations sit and wait. Weapons they have none save the explosive force of ideas, the concept of human rights and social justice, the ideas for which our forefathers fought at Concord and Valley Forge, ideas which many of their children have forgotten or ignored. This is the force that Communist imperialism fears, love of free-

dom, love of country, love of God. As long as these survive in the hearts of men, she cannot conquer all. This is the resistance that she fears; it is for her the shadow of death. It is this spirit, this resistance, that we must help keep alive by our moral and spiritual weapons, by the unceasing cry of protest, the anger of free men beholding tyranny. More than this is needed. Our Government should add strong political and diplomatic measures to supplement the cry.

"If the plight of the captive nations is not powerful enough to motivate us to action, our own plight should do so, for the inescapable fact is that the free world has come to the pass where it must now defend its own self-determination and independence. Will it or not, our fate is tied up with the fate of the captive nations, our freedom is bound up with theirs. As Lincoln said: 'The house of humanity divided against itself cannot endure permanently half slave and half free.' We know our course. We choose freedom for ourselves and all mankind with all the risks this choice demands, because for men who believe in God no other choice is possible. And may the Lord, God of Hosts defend us."

[From the Washington Star, July 17, 1960]

#### MR. K.'S CAPTIVES

Today begins what is known as Captive Nations Week. It is a week designed to keep us and the rest of the world from forgetting one of the ugliest and most tragic stories in modern history of mankind. The story is that of pitiless Soviet imperialism and what it has done to freedom in nearly a dozen once-independent lands.

These lands, in alphabetical order, are Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. The list, which included Yugoslavia until Marshal Tito declared his independence of the Kremlin some years ago, could be justifiably broadened to embrace such other countries as the Ukraine, which has long since been absorbed by the U.S.S.R. But the prime purpose of Captive Nations Week is to focus attention on the imperialistic crimes committed by the Kremlin since the beginning of the Second World War.

The Baltic countries—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—have been gobbled up completely. As for the other victims, they are permitted, under puppet Communist regimes rigidly controlled by Moscow, to maintain some semblance of separateness from the Soviet Union. But this separateness is cruelly limited, and woe betide those who would dare attempt to expand it into genuine independence. The most frightful case in point is what happened to the Hungarian people in 1956 when they staged their heroic uprising for freedom and when Nikita Khrushchev and his colleagues answered them with naked armed force and a literal butchery of all their hopes and dreams.

This is one of the grim facts that will be stressed this week, as it ought to be stressed, by all friends of the once-free peoples now held in captivity behind the Iron Curtain. Certainly, as Ambassador Lodge once put it to the United Nations, "So long as independence remains unachieved, so long as the Soviet Union continues to intervene in the affairs of these countries, we cannot and we will not remain silent and unprotesting." On the contrary, "We will do what we can \* \* \* to show these hapless victims that they are not forgotten, that they are not lost," and we "will continue to supply these people with the truth about our world and the truth about their world. At every opportunity we will assure them that \* \* \* the old ties of kinship and friendship have not been broken."

These words constitute a good text for Captive Nations Week. Free men everywhere, together with their governments,

ought to give the most sober thought to the terrible nature of the crimes committed against the victimized lands. And those crimes, in turn, should serve as a measure of the stunning mendacity and monumental hypocrisy of Nikita Khrushchev's current propaganda assault on the West's American-led "imperialists" and "aggressors." What we face here is something that is at once as dangerous as it is contemptible.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 18, 1960]

#### RUSSIA TOLD SLAVES WILL REBEL IN WAR

Russia was warned here today that if it ever started a war against the free world it would be quickly overrun and overwhelmed by rebellion within its own slave empire.

Justice Michael A. Musmanno, of the State supreme court, told a Captive Nations Week rally at the Roosevelt Hotel that it is a big mistake to regard Russia as an invincible giant.

"Russia itself contains a population of only 96 million people," he said. "The non-Russians within the Soviet Union number 114 million \* \* \* (in) 15 so-called Soviet Socialist Republics which at one time were free and independent nations."

"Along with the puppet nations of Eastern Europe, these republics constitute an ever-present threat to the power of the Kremlin," Justice Musmanno said.

"These nations \* \* \* are moral and spiritual allies of the Western World and should receive our friendship and encouragement," he declared.

The justice said Khrushchev forces the United States to look to our security through never-relaxing vigilance and never-decreasing defensive strength.

"One of the most vital weapons in that defensive strength is the friendship and respect of the captive nations now languishing in chains behind the Iron Curtain," he said.

Col. J. J. Sustar, TV newscaster and former Czechoslovak war hero and diplomat, also spoke at the luncheon rally. William J. Tepsic acted as master of ceremonies and Michael Komichak was chairman of the event.

[From the Clarion, Catholic Parish of Glenview, Ill., July 10, 1960]

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 17 TO 23

Lev E. Dobriansky, one of the originators and authors of the resolution which became Public Law 80-90 to establish this national observance, has now formed the National Committee on Captive Nations Week Observance. This national committee must have support. Contribute whatever you can for the work of promoting this observance on a huge scale. In this way let its voice be heard even in the Kremlin. Contributions to Captive Nations Week Observance, in care of Georgetown University, Washington 7, D.C.

Last year when Captive Nations Week became an official observance in this country, it so touched the nerve center of communism that Khrushchev was obviously shaken. The danger now is that some of our leaders may be happy to let the first anniversary slip by with less ceremony than National Pretzel Week.

The sufferings of the captive nations are beyond belief. Albania, Azerbaijan, Bohemia, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Caucasus, China, Cosackia, Croatia, East Germany, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tibet, Turkistan, and White Ruthenia are the peoples being ground under the iron heel of the Reds. It is not just, it is not Christian, it is not human to negotiate on other matters without first insisting on freedom and free elections for these enslaved, for whose enslavement some of our most respected American leaders are directly to blame before God. In conscience we cannot write off millions who look

to us for help. By negotiating we invite further Red aggression and become slowly reconciled to surrender by default.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader, the Evening News, July 20, 1960]

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAIMED

Mayor Frank P. Slattery has proclaimed the current week, July 17-23, as Captive Nations Week in Wilkes-Barre. The local observance is in conjunction with national Captive Nations Week which was approved by a resolution of Congress and proclaimed by President Eisenhower in recognition of the nations which are still under Communist domination.

Attorney Peter Paul Olszewski, city solicitor, and Stephen J. Tkach, president of Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, are the local members of the national Captive Nations Committee. Congressman DANIEL J. F. FLOON was one of the cosponsors of the House of Representatives resolution setting aside this week for the observance.

Some 22 nations with a total population of 800 million people are still under the heel of international communism, both Soviet and Chinese varieties, the Captive Nations Committee reports.

Rev. Andrew P. Maloney, administrator of St. Mary's Church, 533 North Main Street, Pittston, is also a member of the national committee and Congressman FLOON is an honorary member of the body.

[From the Scranton Tribune, July 21, 1960]

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

President Eisenhower's proclamation setting aside this week for the observance of Captive Nations Week has particular significance here in Scranton and northeastern Pennsylvania.

For here we have family bonds with most of the nations subdued and tyrannized by the Communist captors who have deprived millions of people of their liberties, their freedoms, and the right to govern themselves.

From before the turn of the century and up to fairly recent times our population in this area has been enhanced by men and women from European nations which have since been overrun by the ruthless Soviet despots. And most of these people have relatives and friends still held captive behind the Kremlin-erected Iron Curtain.

So it is particularly significant to us to "manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their aspirations for freedom and national independence," as urged by the President in his proclamation.

And we are in full accord, too, with the desire expressed by Mr. Eisenhower that U.S. Presidents continue to issue proclamations each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

[From the New York Times, July 18, 1960]

#### TWO FAITHS SUPPORT CAPTIVE NATIONS—HEEDING OF THEIR CAUSE IS STRESSED AT ST. PATRICK'S AND ST. JOHN THE DIVINE

Special services were held yesterday in St. Patrick's Cathedral and the Cathedral Church of St. John the Divine to mark the opening of Captive Nations Week.

Twenty-three nations under Communist domination were represented at St. Patrick's by expatriates in native costume.

Cardinal Spellman presided at the 10 a.m. solemn mass. The Very Reverend John A. Flynn, president of St. John's University, was the celebrant, and Msgr. John J. Dougherty, president of Seton Hall University, preached the sermon.

#### USE OF SPIRITUAL FORCES

In the sermon Monsignor Dougherty called prayer and the mass the most powerful weap-

ons of the Roman Catholic Church in its efforts to lift the yoke of Communist tyranny from the enslaved peoples of the world.

"The spiritual authority and dignity of the church are forces behind man's struggle for political, economic, civil, and religious freedom," he said.

"The United States is the hope of the captive nations because they look upon us as the citadel of freedom. This is the destiny committed to us by history, and we must be worthy of it."

Asserting that the Communist ideology "is so opposed to the nature of man and the God of nature that it cannot endure," he added:

"Captive Nations Week is a cry of protest against Communist tyranny that shall not be silenced until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved."

At the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Church of St. John the Divine the Reverend Canon John W. Pyle asked Christians "to strike a blow for Christ" by supporting the oppressed countries behind the Iron Curtain.

"We must make commitments, even though the risk is great," he said. "Unless we take chances, we can never know the true Christian ideal."

"It is entirely right for us to launch out against oppression. As Christians we ought to have identification with those who run a great risk to exercise their faith. The very essence of a belief in the right thing involves risk."

"The most dangerous thing we could do now would be to seek security and safety and forget about those in need."

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, July 20, 1960]

#### ESSAY WRITERS WIN PRIZES—CAPTIVE NATIONS THEME OF PROJECT

Gold and silver medallions were presented to the winners of the American Education Association's essay contest at ceremonies held yesterday in city hall in observance of Captive Nations Week.

The three winners—two New York City high school students and a Hunter College graduate student—were presented with the awards by City Council President Abe Stark. The theme of the essays was "Captive Nations' Contributions to American Society."

The contest was supervised by Mrs. Cathryn L. K. Dorney, editor of the AEA magazine, the Educational Signpost.

The winning students are:

Doris Lynne Garter, a junior at Martin Van Buren High School, gold medallion.

Kevin O'Brien, senior at Archbishop Molloy High School, silver medallion.

Pvt. Paul Benischek, graduate student at Hunter College, now on a 6-month tour of duty with the Army at Fort Dix, N.J., gold medallion.

The contest winners will appear at a mass rally sponsored by the New York State Committee for Captive Nations Sunday at 2 p.m. in Manhattan Center.

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express, July 19, 1960]

#### WEEK OF SOLICITUDE FOR WORLD'S OPPRESSED

The significance of Captive Nations Week, proclaimed by President Eisenhower for countrywide observance, is that—in an undetermined number of years hence—captive nations could refer to all nations if Soviet plans for world conquest are permitted to materialize. At present it refers to Asian and European lands which communism already has brought to heel, and all too soon could refer to lands in the Western Hemisphere which it menaces with its standard plan of action: Infiltration, subversion, and domination.

America would not be America—a sanctuary for seekers of freedom from many lands—if it forgot its traditional ties with



nations now held in the grasp of Red enslavement. These humbled people are in many ways the same as we Americans who cherish a way of life we have chosen for ourselves, but of which they—who once tasted freedom—only can dream despondently while they languish under Red tyranny. We would be strange Americans indeed if we felt no sympathy for them who have suffered every human indignity and outrage at the hands of their conquerors, and yet must endure ruthless subjugation that cries to heaven for vengeance.

They are our friends, believing in us and trusting us not to let them down with a cynical regard of their plight. We owe them the moral support of encouraging them in their hope of divinely vouchsafed deliverance and restoration to a free human estate. We need to grid them to ourselves, as it were with hoops of steel, for even now they are allied with us in spirit and fellow believers in freedom's cause, if not potential recruits in a showdown with aggressive dictatorship.

This week, in our commemoration of the tragic wrongs inflicted upon them, in our responsibility as free men to challenge and condemn their enslavement and in our prayers for their eventual liberation, we shall bring to captive nations comfort, solace and cheer, renewing their faith in things for which to live and in their ultimate realization.

[From the Park Cities North Dallas News, July 14, 1960]

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVED JULY 17-23

It is fitting that during July, the month of freedom, we observe Captive Nations Week, scheduled this year for the week of July 17-23.

By special programs, sermons on freedom, display of the American flag, civic organization luncheon talks, radio and newspaper coverage, film presentations, and essay contest award announcements, it is hoped that the free peoples of the world may continue to be informed and concerned about the captive nations, and offer hope to enslaved millions.

The Presidential proclamation about captive nations stated that "such proclamation should be made each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world." His statement brings to mind the serious dilemma confronting the free world: Shall the captive nations enslaved by communism be written off to the Communists, or shall the free world take an active interest in them, and, what is to be gained or lost through such action.

Khrushchev and his clique, realizing that brute force cannot surpress indefinitely the drive for freedom and independence, has refined his methods with his policy of co-existence. This is the permissible philosophy of one step back under communism, until the propitious moment comes to shoot two steps forward.

It should be called to mind that when Mr. Khrushchev speaks of peaceful coexistence, he means nothing less than American acquiescence to the permanent security of his empire. His purpose is to gain time for the consolidation of his imperialistic empire which would come easy with the broken wills and hopes of the captive nations.

Sometimes reticent in taking a positive step, the free world should now make its position determinately clear to the Communists regarding the captive nations of any nation seeking freedom or self-determination. In a world in which the constant struggle for independence is on the daily newspaper, it would certainly lessen the moral standard of the United States to refuse recognition to these facts. Many of today's nationalist movements found their inspiration in American history. It would

be ironic, if the United States should ever find itself cast in the role of opposing independence movements seeking recognition of the kind of principles which established our own country.

Over 225 million people held captive by the Communists (besides the 700 million Chinese) represent a potent force who can become the free world's most reliable allies. It is also important to note that the stronger the hope and urge of the captives for their freedom and independence, the weaker the threatening position of the Soviets and, consequently the more secure is the status of the free world.

Our course of conduct in foreign relations should be tested by the standards we have pursued in our past. If it advances the cause of freedom, let us pursue it; if it injures the cause of freedom, let us reject it most vehemently. Only then can we hope to maintain our security and peace and at the same time, help others secure their God-given principles of freedom and self-determination. Our ultimate weapon is the inherent desire of all peoples for freedom. This is the peaceful policy of liberation in action. We must be alert to any cracks in the Soviet empire, and encourage and exploit any weakening bonds that tie the satellites to Moscow. In this meaning the idea behind the Captive Nations Week observance had a true and worthy purpose, and should find acceptance among all the free peoples of the world.

[From the New York Times, July 25, 1960]

#### ARTISTS STAGE PROTEST—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MARKED BY DANCES AND MUSIC HERE

Artists representing captive nations staged a colorful demonstration of the spirited music, song, and dance of their homelands before 750 at the Manhattan Center on 34th Street yesterday.

White Russians, Tartars, Cossacks, Latvians, Ukrainians, Hungarians, and Slovaks, all in bright-colored native costumes, performed during the 2-hour program in observance of Captive Nations Week.

Jay Lovestone, assistant head of the international division of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, said more and more Americans saw the fraud of Moscow's coexistence propaganda line. The AFL-CIO supports self-determination everywhere, he said.

[From the Washington Star, July 23, 1960]

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

While in Austria, Khrushchev announced that he hoped to see in his lifetime the symbol of communism—their red flag—flying over the whole world. This has been said before by every other Communist leader. Unfortunately, people seem to ignore it. During the Captive Nations Week we should try to impress upon everyone that Communists are Communists, and not comparable to any well-meaning people, and that they even dare to openly declare their goals. We should understand that they use the word "peace" just to reach their goals, and the greatest "peace" they want to get is the United States of America, and they are deterred right now only by the fear of an upheaval of the captive nations, the spirit of which they are trying to break.

To destroy Khrushchev's plan we should start in the Captive Nations Week a concrete action: we should declare that we want to reach in our lifetime a situation where the symbol of slavery—the red flag—be obliterated and that communism would remain in people's minds only as a nightmare, and that everywhere there would be government of the people, by the people, for the people.

ALFRED S. BERG.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 17, 1960]

#### THE AGE OF SLAVERY

Captive Nations Week begins today on a grim note: Never in all the world's history have so many millions of people lived under oppression and tyranny. For this is not only the dawning space age—it is the age of slavery for 900 million human beings.

Captive Nations Week will not be celebrated—it is being observed solemnly. Justice Michael A. Musmanno of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, who is chairman of the observance in the Pittsburgh district, has urged all "who are attached by family ties to any of the 22 enslaved nations" to display all week the American flag and "the flag of the country of their forebearers."

"I respectfully ask that the people of this area offer up prayers for the liberation of the 900 million people held in cruel Soviet bondage," Justice Musmanno declared. "We must not let them lose hope for their ultimate liberation. Let them know that the American people, who are the amalgamation of all the peoples of the world, believe in their just aspirations."

Perhaps the greatest tragedy of this age, however, is that many millions of these people do not even have such aspirations. Like creatures born in captivity, they have never known freedom and do not resist the stifling regimentation which robs them of their humanity.

#### THE WEEK AND THE RESOLUTION FOR A HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

These reports are only a sample of the coverages given the observance of Captive Nations Week. In every major State and city the activities of the local committees were reported almost daily. In each of these areas and in numerous towns throughout the country, authorities issued their proclamations and resolutions on the Week. As an example, I include here the Resolution issued in the city of Philadelphia:

#### RESOLUTION 65

Resolution requesting the mayor to proclaim Captive Nations Week, July 17-23, 1960, and calling for public observance of this occasion

Whereas the Senate of the United States of America and the House of Representatives of the United States of America have by resolution requested and authorized the President of the United States to designate the week of July 17-23, 1960, as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas the President of the United States has by such proclamation invited the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities; and

Whereas many people have been made captive by the tyrannous policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas there are many good citizens of Philadelphia, whose national origins are associated with the victims of communistic oppression: Therefore

Resolved by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That his honor, the mayor of the city of Philadelphia, be requested to proclaim Captive Nations Week, July 17-23, 1960; and

Resolved, That the citizens of Philadelphia, in accordance with such proclamation, be requested to cooperate in observance of this celebration, in churches, synagogues, civic and patriotic clubs, educational institutions, and wherever such observance should be appropriate.

By the request of the National Captive Nations Committee, the President issued from the summer White House in Newport, R.I., his proclamation of the

1960 Captive Nations Week. The contents of this proclamation are important to my proposal for a House Committee on the Captive Nations. I include it at this point in the RECORD:

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1960

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, A PROCLAMATION

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1960, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 18th day of July in the year of our Lord 1960, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 185th.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

By the President:

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,

Secretary of State.

It is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that as in the case of last year's proclamation—in fact, more so—the Red totalitarians in Moscow reacted sharply and vehemently denounced this recent proclamation by the President and also the observance of the week by our private citizens. On this, the New York Times report on a brief analysis of the 1960 results of Captive Nations Week, as it appears in the August issue of Freedom's Facts, suffice to give us an appreciation of the deep-rooted fear Moscow has of the Captive Nations Week resolution. I incorporate here both the report and the analysis:

[From the New York Times, July 23, 1960]

RUSSIANS DENOUNCE EISENHOWER FOR U.S. CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—LEADERS AND PAPERS REACT WITH ANGER—DECLARE THAT BALTIC PEOPLES REJOICE ON ANNIVERSARY OF "LIBERATION"

(By Osgood Caruthers)

Moscow, July 22.—Soviet leaders and newspapers reacted angrily today to the proclamation in the United States of Captive Nations Week.

Speeches and editorials attacking President Eisenhower (who last Monday pro-

claimed the second annual observance of the week) were published simultaneously with glowing accounts of how the people of the Soviet Baltic republics were celebrating "in festive mood" the 20th anniversary of the establishment of Soviet power.

The official newspapers of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government published greetings from the Kremlin leaders to the Communist chiefs in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

#### HUGE RALLIES ORGANIZED

All through this week huge rallies have been organized to "voice the joy over the liberation of these people from the bourgeois Fascist boot" so that they are now "free to march forward in the building of communism," it was declared.

The scathing sarcasm in which public utterances on the subject of the proclamation of Captive Nations Week was expressed was a clear sign of the indignation with which the Soviet leaders view such action.

They protest with extraordinary vigor that the people of the Baltic States were never better as well off as they are now under Soviet rule.

Setting the keynote on this theme was Mikhail A. Suslov, the Soviet Union's chief Communist theoretician and right-hand man to Premier Khrushchev.

Mr. Suslov attended anniversary festivities in Vilna, the capital of Lithuania, and spoke there last night of how "the American imperialists and their servants are displaying silly efforts to spoil the relations of the peoples of our countries."

"They hope that the remnants of bourgeois nationalism in the Soviet Baltic Republics will survive," he declared, "but all of these hostile machinations are doomed to failure."

"One must lose his senses to propose that the really free peoples of the Soviet take on the chains of imperialist slavery."

#### NIXON'S VISIT RECALLED

It was recalled here that exactly a year ago today Vice President Nixon arrived in Moscow and was almost instantly confronted by Mr. Khrushchev with an angry denunciation of Washington's endorsement of the congressional proclamation of Captive Nations Week. The subject was raised incessantly by Mr. Khrushchev during Mr. Nixon's visit.

The most vehement denunciation of this year's renewal of the proclamation by the White House was an editorial writer in the Communist Party paper Pravda.

He termed the action "just another insolent and stupid international provocation, spiced, moreover, with unpardonable lies."

"If the U.S. President was indeed concerned for the lot of captive nations, he need not have to go far," the writer continued. "Suffice it for him to take a look at what is going on right in his own house to find out whether many are free in America itself. \* \* \*

Similarly, these were expounded by Kremlin leaders in the Baltic capitals during the current celebration.

In Tallinn, the capital of Estonia, Otto V. Kuusinen, Finnish-born member of the ruling Presidium of the Soviet Communist Party, told the inhabitants that Soviet power had brought them benefits. In the Latvian capital of Riga the speaker was Nikolai M. Shvernik, former titular chief of state and also a Presidium member.

[From Freedom Facts, August 1960]

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—1960 RESULTS

Millions of Americans took part in Captive Nations Week observances on July 17 to 23. There were special services in synagogues and churches. There were hundreds of special meetings, observances and rallies.

Through all of these events in many key cities Americans expressed their support for the hopes of captive peoples for freedom and national independence. They pledged them-

selves to struggle by every peaceful means to obtain self-determination and freedom for all captive peoples.

At the rally in Washington, D.C., the Honorable George W. Abbott, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, declared that "as long as any nation is unfree, no nation can be completely free." A former Cuban businessman and lay religious leader, Miguel Kohly, said 90 percent of his countrymen were dedicated to freedom, but the remaining 10 percent were leading the "boldest piracy in history." His Excellency Il Kwon Chung, Ambassador of Korea, declared that there is no place for compromise or neutrality in the fight against communism, and added that freedom has never burned brighter in the bosoms of Koreans.

#### A HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTER SPEAKS

At the same rally an anonymous Hungarian freedom fighter made an eloquent plea. Speaking for peoples of the captive nations he declared, "We, members of the captive East European nations, turn to you, representatives of the free countries. We turn to you from the worst kind of slavery, pleading with you to deliver us from this hell on earth. We plead with you first of all in the name of the Creator, who blessed you with all the beauties, wealth and liberty, leaving us the sorrow, suffering and captivity. Sorrow and suffering are easier to bear, but it is captivity against which we rebel and beg you to aid us in casting off our yoke."

"If things go on the way they have during the immediate past, the tactics of the Communists will conquer every country, one by one. If you, the strongest, are afraid, what can you expect of the really weak? With determination and courage you could save the oppressed and, automatically, save yourselves. The price of your freedom is our freedom."

Senator KENNETH KEATING, Republican, New York, in a statement on the occasion of Captive Nations Week declared, "Their cause is our cause, their sorrow must be our sorrow, for freedom is a brotherhood or it is nothing. God made us to be free, and under God we must pledge to one another, across the oceans, across the curtains of iron, that freedom is not a separate destiny, but a common destiny \* \* \* no free man can have ease of mind while his neighbors are shackled by the brutal chains of the sworn enemy of freedom."

#### THE IMPACT ON COMMUNISTS

What impact did statements like these have upon the Communists in Moscow and in other Communist-ruled capitals? Radio Moscow attacked Captive Nations Week even more bitterly this year than last. Claimed Commentator Orlov on July 19, the Americans cannot "stomach the fraternal relations of equal cooperation and mutual assistance within the Socialist system, for all this is in sharp contrast to their own relations with smaller or weaker countries, a clearcut instance of which are the recent imperialist intrigues, conspiracies, and interventions against Cuba and the Republic of Congo."

Communist propagandists in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Estonia, Albania, and other nations attacked Captive Nations Week as "a lying campaign," as a "slandorous campaign," and as "a provocative act," which could only "make the world public laugh."

The widespread and bitter Communist attack against Captive Nations Week by itself indicates that the truths proclaimed by the week's activities have hit a sensitive spot in the Communist armor. The Communist-propagated fiction that captive nations are free and equal partners in the Communist bloc is exploded by the groveling subservience of Communist rulers of the captive nations to every order and whim of the top Russian Communist.



## PLAN FOR THE FUTURE

Captive peoples are not free to select their own government, make their own laws, run their economy, or decide for themselves the kind of lives they want to lead. All decisions are made by the state and the party and both are run from Moscow.

Captive Nations Week exposed the truth of Communist tyranny to the world, and Communists were hurt. They admit the truth of the charge when they deny the captive people the right to self-determination by a free and secret vote. They know that if captive peoples have the chance, they will throw the Russian Communists and their minions out of power.

By voicing this truth with strength and with conviction, Captive Nations Week puts the Communist masters on the defensive before their own people and before the world. The effectiveness of Captive Nations Week suggests that the struggle needs to be increased through participation of more millions of peoples of the free world. The struggle must continue until all captive peoples can say to the Reds: "Stop running our country and our lives. Go home. We don't want you here."

## DR. DOBRIANSKY'S TELEGRAM TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

The President's reply to this new and harsher denunciation took the form of a challenge to Moscow to accept under U.N. auspices the conduct of free elections in all the captive nations and elsewhere in the world. The importance of such challenges and their follow-up should not be underestimated in the prime area of creational conflict and skillful propaganda they can have lasting results of benefit to the cause of world freedom. This is what the chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee had in mind when he dispatched a telegram to the President, congratulating him for this challenge. As reported in the Chicago Tribune and other national papers, the telegram was as follows:

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,  
Chicago, Ill.

We strongly congratulate you and heartily applaud the challenge of free elections you offered Khrushchev last night in your stir-Convention.

We and countless Americans urge that you and our United Nations Ambassador pressing address at the Republican National this challenge by every means in the forums of world opinion.

I am particularly happy over this development because in a letter addressed to you on September 12, 1959, and in subsequent communications I urged that this kind of challenge be made to Khrushchev in connection with his statements on Captive Nations Week in his foreign affairs article released last August.

Americans throughout the land cannot thank you enough for your Captive Nations Week proclamation last week. Once again Moscow has been rocked by this. It demonstrates again their fear of our Captive Nations Week resolution. We earnestly hope and urge that you will implement the resolution by honoring our proposal to create a Government Agency on Self-Determination of Captive and Occupied Nations which would place Moscow on a perpetual defensive in the cold war. This can be a further and very practical challenge.

Sincerely,

Dr. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,  
Chairman, National Committee on  
Captive Nations Week Observance.

In deriding this challenge Radio Moscow lied in this way:

The tendency of this process is quite evident. Almost half of all mankind has voted in favor of socialism (July 28).

In reply to this lie, we should have recited again and again for all the world to hear, the dates of Russian Communist conquest of all the captive nations listed in the Captive Nations Week resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of our failure to follow up such opportunities as presented to us that I propose the necessary establishment of a House Committee on the Captive Nations. But this is only one reason justifying the creation of this committee. If the Members would read carefully the clauses preceding my resolution, they would recognize immediately the many pressing reasons for such desirable action.

For one, the two Presidential proclamations on Captive Nations Week—last year's and the recent one—call upon the American people to study these nations. A committee of this type would insure continuous studies and inquiries into all the captive nations. It would prove to be a constant source of knowledge and information about the captive nations. Its very existence would serve the purposes set forth and stressed in the Presidential proclamation.

Second, an active committee of this nature would by its studies, inquiries, and investigation, open for us new vistas of conception and understanding about the Soviet Union and the entire Red totalitarian empire. These new dimensions of thought would in turn contribute to the development of new, imaginative, and dynamic ideas and approaches by which we could successfully throw the ideological aggressors upon a perpetual defensive and into eventual defeat in the cold war. With the Powers' trial in Moscow, it would do well for us to bear in mind that almost the entire territory flown over by the U-2 plane is captive non-Russian country. A knowledgeable use of this basic fact at the time of the summit would have kept the Moscow totalitarians talking and thinking about this to present date.

The third additional reason for a House Committee on the Captive Nations is that the products of its systematic and continuous and concentrated work would go a long way to offset and negate Moscow's propaganda and infiltrative efforts in free Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America. For example the focus of our serious attention upon the 35 million Moslems subjugated within the Soviet Union could not have the most salutary effects upon the entire Moslem world. Moreover, the contributions of the committee would bolster and vastly improve our posture and position in the paramount arena of contesting ideas and argument in the cold war.

Fourth, the Congress could display in no better way the pride it has in having legislated the Captive Nations Week resolution than by beginning to implement it with the formation of a permanent committee on the captive nations. As the data I provided here will show, the American people responded vigor-

ously to the resolution in their observance of Captive Nations Week. Responding also to the President's call for the study of these nations, they have articulated the need for such a committee in their recent observances. Mr. Speaker, the resolution I am proposing here is a response to this popular demand, and I feel sure that every Member, after having read the samples of evidence given here, will share this feeling.

It is not enough to express from time to time our sympathy with the captive nations in Europe and Asia. The time has come for us to understand the basic ideology of all the captive nations. Reason, not sentiment is determinative here. The captive nations in the aggregate are perhaps even more important to our national security and that of the nontotalitarian free world than space conquests, missile superiority, and a host of other things. They are our great and formidable deterrent against the outbreak of a hot global war. So long as colonial and imperialist Moscow remains permanently insecure with regard to its captive masses, it will certainly venture into no hot war. Quite emphatically, it could scarcely afford one, for the captive nationals within the armed forces of the Soviet Union itself would be a constant threat and then an eruptive force in the empire. The captive nations in the aggregate are both an insurance for continued peace and a weapon for the advance of world freedom. They represent a tremendous strategic value for the forces of freedom.

This strategic value more than justifies the need for establishing a House Committee on the Captive Nations. Because of this value to our national security, we have rightly and appropriately formed specialized committees in the areas of space, atomic energy, and economics. The strategic value of all the captive nations, which means also those in the Soviet Union, is in itself a compelling and urgent reason for us to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is for this fundamental reason and all that it implies that I offer and submit for action in this session the following resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations:

Whereas two Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations; and

Whereas the nationwide observance in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas, following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the observance of Captive Nations Week in 1960, Moscow displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and

monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkistan, North Vietnam, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of noninterference in the internal affairs of states and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the two Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unrelenting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

**Resolved**, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party and of whom five shall be members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

**SEC. 2. (a)** Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

**(b)** The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman,

the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

**(c)** A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

**SEC. 3. (a)** The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which include those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

**(b)** The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1962.

**SEC. 4.** The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

**SEC. 5.** The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

Mr. Speaker, the heart of the matter is that we are helping ourselves when we look to the interests of the captive nations. They are a strong factor in deterring the Kremlin from outright aggression that would provoke a nuclear war. Khrushchev knows he presides over a very uneasy empire. He realizes full well that the so-called Soviet Union is largely a political fiction, a forced alliance of peoples with past histories of independence, glorious cultures, and their own folkways. The Soviet rulers know better than anyone else the repressive measures they are required to use to keep the peoples of the captive nations prisoners. And, above all, the Soviet ruling clique is totally aware that the nations held in captivity dream of freedom and independence and a return to their once proud sovereignty. In such a situation, a strong third force would be on the side of the free world in the event of hostilities. Imagine the havoc such a force could inflict on Communist military installations, transportation, food supplies. Yes; the captive nations are a deterrent to war, and are at the same time strong, natural allies of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, history informs us that tyranny bears the seeds of its own ruin. Down through the ages it has been thus, one tyrant after another met his ruin in the blood baths of his own instigation. Many of us here today remember Hitler boasting that the Reich of his own violent creation would continue in glory down for a thousand years. We all remember, too, how this madman perished by his own plan of destruction, cornered literally like a rat, in a Berlin bunker—this bloodstained edifice pulled down round his own villainous head.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we serve our Republic and the free world well when we look to cause of freedom for all mankind. Freedom is America's business—it has always been so and, pray God, it will always be so.

Let us now send out word and keep sending it out to the peoples of the captive nations that they are not forgotten in America—that their plight is our concern, that we shall never be reconciled to their sorry condition, that we shall continue to use every peaceful means at our command to bring about their release, their restoration to freedom.

What I propose here today is the development of another effective instrument to bring about that happy day of independence for these millions gripped in the vise of Red tyranny.

In all solemnity, Mr. Speaker, I say: Let us tend the lamps of freedom—the hour is late and the night is dark—but the dawn will be ours when all men may walk upright in freedom, and Red tyranny has been crushed.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], for the excellent presentation he is making here today. I know few men who are as fully qualified to know the real meaning of the threat of communism as does Mr. Flood. In 1952, the gentleman from Pennsylvania was a member of the Select Committee of the House of Representatives that investigated the Katyn Forest massacre, and the gentleman, indeed, played one of the key roles in writing the indictment—the first indictment against the Soviet Union for committing this monstrous atrocity against some 15,000 Polish Army officers who were our gallant allies in World War II. I think the gentleman's analysis of the importance of this captive nation's resolution which the Congress adopted last year is, indeed, very penetrating and the gentleman would be happy to know that only this year in the city of Chicago in pursuance of the captive nations' resolution, we held a great service and ceremony on Captive Nations Day. Some 5,000 people attended. I would like to stress the importance of this point that the gentleman has brought up. This ceremony was arranged by Mayor Daly. It was a magnificent sight to see the representatives of the 14 captive nations, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania just mentioned, standing there with their national banners and flags raised high and their voices and their hopes high that some day these captive nations would join the family of free nations of the world. I congratulate the gentleman for the outstanding presentation he is making today.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois. He is very kind. I am especially glad to see him here because he very graciously referred, Mr. Speaker, to my connection with the famous Katyn massacre investigation.



That massacre investigation would not have got anyplace at all if it had not been for the fact that this brilliant young man, now a Member of this distinguished body, was at that time my chief clerk and my chief interpreter. He was my right arm all through the months of this investigation. Since that time, I think largely because of his great service, the people of his great district in rural Illinois saw fit to send him here to join us so we could have the benefit of his experience as a colleague.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], for continuing to bring to the attention of this body and the country the grave danger we are in. I think the gentleman's plan could put the Soviet Union on the defensive in 5 minutes if we would adopt this plan and appeal to the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain, as well as outside of the Iron Curtain.

For years we have been on the defensive. This plan could put the Soviet Union on the defensive instantly. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. I am glad my friend from South Carolina has taken this time. He has been with me for 10 years here when we both have been making this kind of speech, and I am glad to have his South Carolina dignity and accent added to this. Our southern colleagues are renowned for their patriotism and their opposition to communism and all it stands for. He speaks well for the South. I was born and raised in the South. I am not a "damyankee," I am just a "Yankee." I am glad he is here today to say those words.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his introduction of this resolution to create a House Committee on Captive Nations. I would like to associate myself with his remarks, Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the resolution, expressing the sense of Congress that the subject of captive nations should be included at the summit conference.

I am particularly pleased to support this measure. It is especially significant, Mr. Speaker, at this time, in view of the tragic scuttling of the summit conference by the Communists.

I ask unanimous consent to include my remarks on this subject at the conclusion of the speech by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOLL].

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsyl-

vania, one of the most valiant fighters against communism in the entire country. I compliment him for his splendid remarks on the subject of captive nations. I have a great number of people in my district who have relatives in these captive nations, Polish, Hungarian, Rumanian. I believe the people in these countries eventually will gain their freedom.

I wish to associate myself with every sentiment the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expressed.

Mr. FLOOD. I am very pleased with these expressions of support. I know the great city my friend comes from. Upon occasion I feel called upon to recognize him not as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but the gentleman from Philadelphia.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I also wish to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his remarks and would just like to point out that at the time this Katyn Massacre Committee was appointed there was a great deal of doubt in the minds of some Members of Congress as to whether or not it could serve any useful purpose. However, history has told us that that Committee has served a tremendously useful purpose. It has been my privilege to have been back of the Iron Curtain twice since then.

I know that everyone behind the Iron Curtain knows the great work done by that committee, and I think the committee proposed now can do a great service for our Nation, and for the cause of freedom everywhere.

One of the weaknesses of our policy is that we have frequently indicated our sympathy with people behind the Iron Curtain, but we have never yet developed the right kind of policy with regard to those people. A committee of the kind the gentleman is suggesting could do a great service for this Nation and for the cause of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. FLOOD. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Speaker, he served with me invaluable upon the committee making the Katyn massacre investigation, and may I remind you, Mr. Speaker, his name is MACHROWICZ. He has the honor and served bravely and nobly with the Polish armed forces before our country was in the war, and fought communism with his blood and his strong right arm with the armed forces of the motherland from which his people came. So he yields to no one in his awareness of the dangers and evils of atheistic communism and in patriotism and love of our country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the Congressman

from Pennsylvania in sponsoring a resolution to establish a House Committee on Captive Nations.

As cosponsor of the recent captive nations resolution which was approved by the House last spring, I believe that this is a most appropriate followup to demonstrate to the Soviet Union and to the world our continuing and persistent concern with the fate of the captive peoples.

The captive nations, as has been pointed out on the floor today, constitute a powerful and effective third force in our fight against Communist tyranny.

The establishment of a House committee to deal exclusively with the problems of the captive nations will give new heart and courage to these oppressed peoples and will reassure them that we shall continue to use every peaceful means to restore them to independence and freedom.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] on his introduction of the resolution to create a House Committee on Captive Nations, and I would like to associate myself with his remarks. As a cosponsor of the resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the subject of the captive nations be discussed at the summit conference, I am particularly pleased to support this measure. It is especially significant at this time in view of the tragic scuttling of the summit conference by the Communists.

Among the most glaring contradictions to the claims of the Communists that theirs is the flower-strewn road to the future is the existence of the captive nations which adorn the periphery of the Soviet State. In not one of these countries did communism assume control of the government with the consent of the majority. In not one of these countries was the path to power of the Communists marked by anything but human misery, privation, and death. The very existence of the captive nations gives the lie to the pretensions of the Communists about the benefits of their brutal system. Stripped of their treasure and forced to bow to military and economic tyranny, the captive nations present a tragic exhibit of what the rest of the world can expect from Communist domination.

Their story is a grim warning to the free nations but it is also a challenge. We cannot let others become captives of the Communists and we must offer every hope to the already enslaved to encourage their adherence to freedom, that they will eventually regain their independence. Just as we undertake to plan strategy to counter Communist efforts here at home and to prevent its expansion abroad, so must we likewise consider how we can best assist the captive nations in their deep-seated desire to reachieve their freedom. The investigation and study that the proposed committee can make in this field can be of immeasurable benefit to future policy formulation. In addition, its activities can provide all of us with a deeper knowledge of the problems and conditions with which the peoples of these nations must cope.

Mr. Speaker, I want to endorse the proposal by our colleague and I hope that the House will see fit to adopt his resolution in the time that yet remains before we adjourn.

#### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may sit this afternoon during special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### RETIREMENT OF PETER J. CAHILL, SECRETARY-TREASURER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able leaders of Federal employee groups, and one who has honored me with his friendship, has reached the mandatory retirement age of 65. This week, at the Cincinnati convention of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Secretary-Treasurer Peter J. Cahill will round out a career that began 47 years ago when he went to work for the Post Office Department in Boston.

From personal experience he learned that the lot of a letter carrier was not an easy one, and he determined to do something about it. He joined the NALC where his intelligence, his initiative, and his courage singled him out as a natural representative for his fellow workers.

He gave his heart and soul to the unrelenting efforts of improving the working conditions and wages of the letter carriers. This loyalty and devotion to their best interests won increasing recognition, finally resulting in his election as national secretary. It is significant that, in 1956, when the offices of secretary and treasurer were consolidated, Peter Cahill was the first man chosen to shoulder that dual responsibility.

It is no mere coincidence that the NALC has made such progress, both in its organizational growth, and in the promotion of its programs during the time that he was a national officer. For he never spared himself. His energy and his sincerity impressed everyone he met, and lifted the esprit de corps of the NALC to an alltime high.

I was a frequent companion of his on many plane trips between Boston and Washington, and so I came to know his personal interest in the letter carriers who were his second family, and of his earnest desire to help them in every possible way.

The greatest satisfaction that he takes with him into retirement is that he succeeded far beyond his, and their, expectations.

For he fought the good fight that not only benefited the letter carriers, but provided the leadership that indirectly strengthened the prestige and raised the living standards of every Federal employee.

We congratulate Pete Cahill on his long and constructive career and his many accomplishments in behalf of every letter carrier in the Nation.

We know that the many years of retirement that stretch ahead will be filled with every happiness and fulfillment for Peter Cahill, in return for his faith and pride in his fellow human beings.

#### BOYD LEEDOM

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it has recently come to my attention that Boyd Leedom, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, is actively engaging in partisan politics. To my mind his conduct raises grave questions of propriety, which I should like to outline to the House.

As the Members of the House are of course aware, the National Labor Relations Board is an independent agency having important semi-judicial functions. It administers the National Labor Relations Act, that is, the Wagner Act as amended by the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts. That is a highly controversial piece of legislation, and the labor disputes which come before the Board for adjudication are often of such a nature that they arouse intense partisanship. I doubt that anyone will question that the Board should be comprised of fair-minded members who are not themselves partisans of either labor or management.

Indeed the Board itself has always been most insistent on its neutral, judicial role. Successive Chairmen of the Board have, for example, declined on this ground to express to the Congress any views on substantive amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. When Mr. Leedom appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor last year, he started out like this:

As you know from my previous appearances here we are not proponents of any legislation particularly. In fact, we, as quasi-judicial officers, prefer to stay out of the policy area of legislation.

However, Boyd Leedom is not merely Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board. He is also general chairman of a Mundt for Senate committee. In this latter capacity he has circulated a letter which I would like to read to the House:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SOUTH DAKOTANS  
MUNDT FOR SENATE COMMITTEE,  
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1960.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: One of the most important Senate races this year will take place in South Dakota where Congressman

McGOVERN, a protege of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and the ADA, is trying to unseat Senator KARL MUNDT.

I know that it is not necessary to list for you the many accomplishments of Senator KARL MUNDT. All of us know of the grand fight which he has made for economy and sanity in Government over the last 12 years in the Senate and for 10 years before that in the House of Representatives. He has become a recognized leader in the battle against the encroachments of socialistic schemes in America. South Dakota and the Nation cannot afford to lose from its Senate ranks this true defender of constitutional government.

Senator MUNDT has an especially tough campaign since certain labor leaders have announced that he is on their purge list. These labor leaders are making many thousands of dollars available to his opponent. KARL cannot hope to match these labor dollars with his own and is doing his best with the limited funds he has available to carry on a successful campaign in South Dakota.

We South Dakotans who live in the District and the distinguished Members of the House and the Senate who comprise an honorary committee are sponsoring a recognition luncheon for Senator MUNDT at the Plaza Room of the Continental Hotel at 12:30 noon on June 27, 1960. Your generous assistance to make this testimonial to Senator MUNDT a success is needed.

Please return your contribution of \$50 or more in the enclosed envelope and indicate on the enclosed card whether or not you will be in attendance at the luncheon so that the committee can make the necessary reservations. For each \$50 contribution a luncheon reservation will be made if you so desire.

Sincerely yours,

BOYD LEEDOM,  
General Chairman.  
ROWLAND JONES,  
Chairman, Men's Division.  
VIVIAN ANDERSON,  
Chairman, Women's Division.

This activity of Mr. Leedom raises to my mind two important questions.

In the first place it suggests the possibility that the Hatch Act may be in need of clarification as to whether it bars partisan political activity by persons occupying positions such as that held by Mr. Leedom. The Hatch Act provides that—

No officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns. \* \* \*

It goes on, however, to exempt from this prohibition four classes of office holders including:

(4) officers who are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the nationwide administration of Federal laws.

I do not know whether or not members of quasi-judicial agencies are regarded as coming within this excepted category. The language of the statute looks as if it is only meant to exempt from the Hatch Act presidential appointees having major policyforming roles, rather than members of independent quasi-judicial agencies who carry out policies enacted by the Congress in legislation.

Whatever the proper construction of the present law, it seems to me that it



is highly debatable whether members of independent quasi-judicial agencies should be permitted to engage in partisan political activity. It is my impression that appointees to Federal boards and commissions have in general refrained from such activities. I cannot recall any fund-raising activities comparable to Mr. Leedom's being undertaken by members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, or the Federal Trade Commission, or even the Federal Communications Commission. As far as I can learn Mr. Leedom's predecessors on the Labor Board have without exception refrained from actively engaging in politics while members of the Board.

I tend to think that they were well advised. The laws which these agencies administer are themselves products of the political process, and it is difficult to see how a person administering these laws can actively participate in partisan politics without casting doubt on his own impartiality in administering the law.

That brings me to the second issue raised by Chairman Leedom's activities. Mr. Leedom's letter, which I have read to the House, indicates to me that he is antiunion. Mr. Leedom's letter declares that Senator MUNDT is a leader in the battle against "the encroachments of socialistic schemes in America," and it goes on to say that Senator MUNDT has an especially tough campaign "since certain labor leaders have announced that he is on their purge list." Leedom's letter then states, on what authority I do not know, that these unidentified labor leaders are making many thousands of dollars available to Senator MUNDT's opponent.

This is antiunion propaganda, pure and simple. Mr. Leedom has a perfect right to hold antiunion views, and to express them, but is he qualified to head a quasi-judicial agency which adjudicates disputes between unions and employers? If I were a union man I would not want Mr. Leedom as my judge. He has openly proclaimed his antiunion bias.

It is also pertinent to consider the identity of Leedom's associate in this political fundraising drive. As I stated, Mr. Leedom signed these fund-soliciting

letters as "General Chairman of a MUNDT for Senate Committee." They are also signed by Rowland Jones as "Chairman, Men's Division."

Who is this Rowland Jones? I should suppose that there are very few Members of this House who do not know who Mr. Jones is. He is the president of the American Retail Federation. He has been very active for many years as an employer lobbyist on labor legislation. The Landrum-Griffin Act passed last years testifies to his effectiveness.

Just what sort of man is Boyd Leedom that he sees no impropriety in engaging in a political fundraising venture in partnership with a lobbyist for an employer association? Let me ask this: How would employers feel if the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board engaged in fundraising activities on behalf of a Senator notably friendly to unions and in conjunction with a union official? I can tell you: They would scream to the high heaven. I would not blame them.

I frankly cannot understand how anyone can condone or excuse Leedom's conduct in this matter. It seems to me that even Mr. Leedom should have enough discretion and sense of propriety to resign. If he does not do so voluntarily, the President should call for his resignation.

However, it is apparent that discretion is not Leedom's forte, and the Congress, too, has a responsibility in this matter. For that reason I am today introducing a resolution directing and authorizing the House Labor Committee to look into the matter of partisan political activity by the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

#### NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINE CROP PRICE SUPPORT COMMODITY LOANS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the many statements made by responsible persons in the Democratic Party over their concern for the small farmer, it is difficult for me to understand why this Congress had deliberately refused to extend a limitation on Commodity Credit Corporation loans for the 1961 crops. The Banking and Currency Committee has refused to even hold hearings on H.R. 9303 and the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee repelled my effort to extend the limitation place on the appropriation bill for fiscal 1960 to the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1961. The end result, of course, will be that the large corporation farmers that are listed below or other borrowers of comparable amounts will again exploit the resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the 1961 crop and this exploitation will be charged to the Department of Agriculture. There will follow the usual demand next year for further relief for the average size midwestern frontier. Here is one opportunity we have missed.

The failure to take action by the 86th Congress is in direct conflict with the announced aims and objectives of the Democratic Party for agriculture and I think this is an appropriate and effective means to so advise the farmers of America.

Further, Mr. Speaker, at the time of the debate on the floor of the House in 1959 on imposing this \$50,000 limitation, several Members insisted most of these loans were repaid and, therefore, no loss was sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The table below and others on file in my office clearly indicate that the large loans are only rarely, if ever, repaid and thereby a great loss is imposed on the taxpayer and again charged to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, although only the loans in excess of \$50,000 are indicated on the tables below, I have on file in my office and in the Department of Agriculture, a list of loans over \$25,000 and also an indication whether or not they have been repaid.

#### U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

1959 crop corn price support loans made of \$25,000 or more and amount repaid by producer

Producer	Address	Bushels pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid	Producer	Address	Bushels pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>					<b>MISSOURI</b>				
M. E. & Frank Silva Co.	Isleton	42,858	\$54,001.08		Myers Farms	Brunswick	63,000	\$73,710.00	
<b>ILLINOIS</b>					Alber Painton Co., Inc.	Painton	49,869	57,848.04	
Cote Farms, Inc., care of L. D. Corkins, president.	St. Anne	161,936	182,987.68		<b>NEBRASKA</b>				
James Yontz	San Jose	53,760	61,286.40		Morrison & Quirk	Harvard	80,000	88,000.00	
<b>INDIANA</b>					J. R. Brown	Clarks	79,106	84,643.42	
Creighton Bros.	Warsaw	51,830	58,567.90		Ned Tyson	Herman	71,508	77,228.64	
Overmyer Farms, Inc.	Wolcott	46,100	52,093.00		Bob Hawthorne and Dr. O. A. Kostal	Giltner	47,455	50,776.85	
<b>MINNESOTA</b>					Ernest and Robert E. Hundahl	Tekamah	46,894	50,176.58	
Harold & Dale Duncanson	Mapleton	60,466	62,884.64						

1959 crop cotton, purchases exceeding \$25,000

Producer	Address	Bales purchased	Amount	Producer	Address	Bales purchased	Amount
ALABAMA				LOUISIANA			
Manldin, E. F.	Town Creek	600	\$103,102.69	Frierson, C. N.	Shreveport	1,000	\$162,739.42
A. Fleming & Sons	Huntsville	363	62,378.86	Robinson Co.	do	923	159,544.03
Rice, Joe, Jr.	North Port	309	52,879.76	Clements Bros.	Ida	703	122,277.04
ARIZONA				Barham, Inc.	Oak Ridge	686	110,200.02
Goodyear Farms	Litchfield Park	2,229	387,272.04	Dominick, A. C.	Mira	537	88,960.99
Arizona Farming Co.	Eloy	1,309	212,287.73	Hutchinson, W. J. & Sons	Caspiana	475	77,802.00
Farmers Investment Co.	Tucson	1,194	201,513.08	Dominick, Paul W.	Mira	445	74,489.35
L. V. L. Ranches, Inc.	Palo Verde	916	161,491.81	Frierson, L. S., Jr.	Shreveport	415	69,397.14
Kal, John	Marana	787	147,242.13	Ellerbe, Cecelia L.	do	381	60,453.64
Rancho Tierra Prieta	Eloy	815	145,558.97	Elm Grove Plantation, Inc.	McDade	397	60,306.57
Shawyer Farms	Phoenix	762	134,925.95	Hutchinson, C. M. & Son	Shreveport	358	59,927.94
Pretzer, Alex and Norman	Eloy	765	133,383.00	Lynn Estate	Gilliam	340	58,960.35
Robertson, Peter J.	Coolidge	731	131,068.16	Viola, R. J.	Benton	247	58,755.23
Rogers, J. L., B. L., and Darwin	Eloy	756	130,166.43	Moore, Tom P., Jr.	Vivian	330	54,795.54
Wong Enterprises	Marana	678	129,671.46	Rosedale Plantation	Benton	321	53,870.00
Aura Plantation	do	678	129,441.61	Stinson, R. T.	Bossier City	314	52,897.95
Roberts, J. A.	Casa Grande	711	123,333.11	Panola Co., Ltd.	Newellton	318	52,167.35
Wong, Bing K.	Marana	666	121,820.20	MISSISSIPPI			
Lane & Lane	Casa Grande	697	113,882.91	Seligman, D.	Shaw	2,471	448,477.55
Coury Bros.	Mesa	628	101,954.49	Kyle, S. W. & Dorothy W.	Clarksdale	1,933	335,977.30
M. B. M. Farms	Phoenix	524	90,461.38	Duncan, Wm	Inverness	1,529	262,620.77
Barkley, J. F.	Somerton	488	85,224.35	Yandell Bros.	Vance	1,495	259,561.13
Waddell Ranch Co.	Waddell	469	81,672.79	Harbert, A., Messrs. B. F.	Robinsonville	1,274	241,088.12
Lewis, Woodrow	Chandler	426	76,432.48	Owen, C. P.	do	1,290	212,206.65
Pima Community Farms	Seaton	477	76,226.48	Rayner, E. D.	Merigold	957	171,991.73
Avra Land & Cattle Co.	Tucson	418	73,010.72	Scruggs, W. P.	Doddsville	980	170,318.29
Urrea, Charles & Son	Mesa	412	71,820.54	Billups Plantation, Inc.	Greenwood	962	170,292.86
Price, Arthur E.	Chandler	388	68,106.38	Flowers, Roy	Mattson	889	155,595.18
Robnett, John D.	Eloy	404	68,067.03	Owen, R. W.	Tunica	890	146,531.12
Anderson Bros.	Casa Grande	379	64,635.82	Kline Planting Co.	Alligator	822	145,945.14
Finley Bros.	Gilbert	369	61,567.67	McKee, F. B.	Friars Point	745	137,280.33
Youngkes Farms	Buckeye	352	60,245.63	Brooks Farming Co.	Drew	665	123,774.82
Singh, John D.	Casa Grande	353	59,702.43	Erwin, W. F. & L. M.	Duncan	656	119,926.06
Wuertz, H.	Coolidge	364	59,247.23	Highland Plantation	Greenville	665	112,713.04
Neely, W. R.	Chandler	336	58,080.62	M. S. Knowlton Co.	Perthshire	666	109,693.80
Holland, Howard	Coolidge	327	57,880.33	McKee, J. & M.	Friars Point	585	107,128.49
Palmer, Dan	do	346	56,206.28	McKee, W. L., Jr.	do	600	104,866.62
Ulmer, I. D.	Marana	283	52,865.34	W. C. Skates & Son	Avon	602	103,927.95
Church, Bruce	Yuma	277	50,700.57	Home Place	Benton	574	100,192.27
Estrella Land & Cattle Co.	Glendale	301	50,698.00	Kay Planting Co.	Indianola	604	98,679.17
ARKANSAS				Owens, S. W.	Tunica	556	94,037.16
Lee Wilson & Co.	Wilson	3,500	580,050.71	McKee, John B.	Friars Point	500	91,167.83
Chapin, S. C.	Trumann	1,320	234,421.98	Green Hill Plantation	Midnight	524	88,853.45
Lephew, W. E.	Dermott	1,111	197,279.14	Seward & Son	Louise	498	87,451.77
Miller Lumber Co.	Marianna	520	88,043.77	Arnold, S. A., Jr.	Tunica	511	87,089.18
Kuhn, R. T., Mrs.	Marion	430	71,097.89	Bramlett, Leon B.	Clarksdale	530	86,896.78
Haraway, Al.	Helena	366	65,213.16	Allen Gray Estate	Benoit	469	83,365.79
CALIFORNIA				Howarth, J. A., Jr.	Cleveland	501	82,067.06
Bennett, Hugh	Firebaugh	2,487	416,176.79	Carr Planting Co., Inc.	Clarksdale	416	75,433.41
Wilco Produce Co.	Blythe	1,898	347,688.61	Maynard Bros. Messrs.	do	481	73,297.58
South Lake Farms	Fresno	1,765	300,605.83	Race Track Plantation	Greenwood	421	67,983.30
Bryant, D. M., Jr.	Pond	1,758	295,364.49	Bryan, J. N.	Belzoni	456	65,966.28
Pilbros Bros, Inc.	Fresno	1,559	275,586.15	Husbandville Plantation	Hollyridge	370	64,336.81
Delta Farming Co.	Corcoran	1,508	262,283.27	St. Rest Plantation	do	368	63,878.60
Gummarra Vineyard Corp.	Bakersfield	1,300	225,532.25	Brown, Norman	Ducan	366	63,612.74
McCarthy & Hildebrand	do	1,288	219,560.05	Seward, Byron	Midnight	362	63,403.23
Raymond Thomas, Inc.	Five Points	1,275	212,838.20	Hayward, A. M.	Greenwood	354	63,358.10
Milham Farms	Bakersfield	1,105	188,228.30	Smith, J. R.	Merigold	357	62,566.21
Murry Land Co.	Hanford	1,042	176,505.04	Pembble, T. E.	do	336	60,453.94
M. & R. Sheep Co.	Oldate	954	171,828.44	Hayward & Jacks.	Greenwood	332	59,158.28
Metzler, Alex	Helm	951	161,120.84	Harris, R. B.	Midnight	344	57,412.88
Stamoules, S. & Co.	Mendota	866	152,707.24	Haney, H. M.	Jonestown	317	54,764.84
Shwartz Farms, Inc.	Stratford	833	147,283.50	Bridgforth, Allen	Yazoo City	301	54,288.93
Scott & Knappenberger	Blythe	790	137,252.64	McClellan, Mrs. W. E.	Philip	288	54,187.50
McCarthy, F. J. & Sons	Tulare	750	134,010.86	Ganier, E. J.	Percy	304	52,145.42
Triple J Farms	Bakersfield	648	110,461.40	Rich, M. H., & Son	Chatham	317	51,832.42
Nelson, H. O.	Madera	587	102,990.54	NEW MEXICO			
Kenworthy, W. K.	Blythe	554	102,018.27	Wamel, R. H.	Animas	367	68,536.95
Conn, John C.	Coalinga	543	93,932.83	NEVADA			
Jones Farms	Stratford	524	91,678.50	Williams, W. J.	Pahrump	598	115,504.55
Kirschenmann, Arnold	Bakersfield	547	90,704.00	TENNESSEE			
Carlucci Bros.	Dos Palos	526	90,196.63	Pacific Place	Memphis	913	147,423.92
Mitchellinda Ranch, Inc.	Alpaugh	523	89,059.07	C. B. Box Co.	do	458	72,888.19
Glotz, William E.	Tranquillity	461	81,119.77	TEXAS			
Fratris, Kenneth E.	Tulare	467	80,332.48	Smith, Rolla D.	Raymondville	1,093	189,192.70
Piekgrass Bros.	Visalia	453	77,655.63	Valley Land Co.	El Paso	825	166,436.35
Favier Bros.	Merced	427	73,318.91	Worsham Bros., partners	Pecos	762	137,556.66
Lovelace, Joe	Coalinga	410	72,446.67	Clark & Roberts	do	576	111,868.10
Suckut, Albert L.	Bakersfield	421	71,722.95	Ballenger & Ballenger	Sebastian	544	93,323.61
Airway Farms, Inc.	Fresno	393	65,353.88	La Casita Farms	Rio Grande City	379	71,186.94
Matheson, O. F. & C. H.	Five Points	383	65,340.43	Mayfield, Oscar	Taft	422	70,605.66
Freeborn Bros.	Buttonwillow	375	64,407.72	Fraley, Coy	Pecos	372	68,593.13
Burhans & Trew, Inc.	Wasco	346	61,479.20	Kilgore, Loy	do	370	67,186.80
Baker Bros.	Earlimart	338	57,931.01	Perry Bros.	Shallowater	458	67,168.49
Deer Creek Cattle Co.	Corcoran	349	57,207.77	Middleton, R. M.	O'Donnell	427	60,590.88
Zozaya & Municha	Firebaugh	328	56,791.29	Kiker Bowden Seed Farms	Plainview	423	57,313.24
Turnbow, G. D.	Bakersfield	332	55,963.62	Imperial Farms	El Paso	278	55,430.40
Eastside Farms	Stratford	306	54,391.51	McMurry, W. J.	Seminole	324	53,159.07
Marietta Farms, et al.	Mendota	322	53,480.31	Johnston, Bentley	DeKalb	333	50,983.41
Chaffin, Roy & Sons	Callipatria	312	53,276.38				
Lady Bros.	Pond	306	52,070.88				
Hansen, Philip	Corcoran	293	51,293.96				
Murray, Wayne	do	284	50,984.89				
Hildebrand, W. E.	Burrel	293	50,648.79				
Freeman, D. E.	Firebaugh	284	50,222.84				



NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY BEING AN ELECTION YEAR, TENDS TO DIVERT ATTENTION FROM THE FACT THAT IT IS ALSO THE YEAR FOR THE SIXTH TARIFF-CUTTING CONFERENCE AT GENEVA OF THE GENERAL AGREEMENTS ON TARIFFS AND TRADE, AN ORGANIZATION OF OVER 40 NATIONS COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS GATT

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the eyes and ears of all adult Americans have seen and heard the intraparty debates throughout the spring of 1960. Then during the summer months our attention was focused upon the tactics and strategy of pre-convention activities and finally upon the respective conventions themselves in Los Angeles and Chicago.

As the two political nominees prepare for the final contest during the autumn months, November 8 looms in the public's gaze.

While all this is in keeping with our splendid American political traditions it disturbs me that the public's attention should be diverted at such a high pitch and at such length from other significant events during 1960.

For example, 1960 and 1961 is GATT year—General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade—the year when delegates from over 40 nations deliberate at Geneva over further penetration of America's commercial market. This is the sixth tariff-cutting conference of the member nations of GATT, an organization which our State Department cosponsored and fostered without authorization from the Congress and the people.

The assemblage of the international delegates from every corner of the globe unfortunately comes at an untimely moment; namely, the American election year, because I fear few will note its passing though many will feel its effects.

On Friday, May 27, 1960, the State Department released its long GATT list, commonly known as the offer list of American-made products to be subject to further tariff cuts this year. The list contains over 2,000 items and will represent the sixth market giveaway program since 1947.

The U.S. offer list represents possible losses of billions of dollars in domestic sales and the jobs which backstop them. Our new offerings will be dutifully dropped into the bottomless pit of international relations without so much as a by-your-leave to American industry, agriculture, and labor.

Here, for instance, are a few of the American-made products whose markets will be offered to our foreign competitors:

Alloy and tool steel, antifriction bearings, airplanes, abrasives, agricultural

implements, alcoholic beverages, automotive equipment, apparel, brass and copper, bicycles, batteries, brushes, buttons, bottles, chemicals, cordage, cutlery, cattle, clocks, candy, carpets, dairy products, explosives, electrical equipment, fur, furniture, fish, glassware, hats, handtools, iron and steel products, linen, leather, lace, mirrors, machinery, meat, manmade fibers, meters, metal products, musical instruments, motorboats, nuts, optical goods, pharmaceuticals, paper, paint, pens and pencils, phonographs, padlocks, photographic equipment, playing cards, rubber goods, razors, scissors, shears, scientific instruments, sugar, soap, shoes, textile machinery, textiles, toys, vegetable oil, vegetables, valves, wool products.

It is understood from excellent authority that the State Department's list was to be revealed to the public and particularly our producing community, whose markets are at stake, at least by the first of March. Then, we were told it would be by April, and later early May.

Time, of course, was all important. Our domestic industries had to review the highly complex technical offer list to determine if their product was slated for GATT's autumn auction; they had to prepare detailed briefs and statements and file them no later than June 27, 1960.

Considering the long holiday weekend at the end of the month of May this gave our side, the American side, less than a month's notice to carry out their investigations and preparations from beginning to end.

Some companies, trade associations, and other organizations were barely able to file more than a note of protest on the inclusion of their product on the GATT list. For others time ran out before the chief executive of the organization could poll his board of directors for the necessary authorization to make a policy statement.

The Department of State, which has woven the web of free trade, free of tariff, around our industry now prepares to draw it even tighter this year and next at Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. Speaker, last year's imports were valued at \$15 billion. This was the foreign, not the U.S. value of these imports. Our Government is to my knowledge the only nation in the world which so evaluates its imports. Furthermore, it should be noted, in 1959 an additional \$15 billion appeared on the debit side of our balance-of-payments ledger for a total of almost \$30 billion.

Foreign affairs can be a rather expensive luxury for the taxpayer already heavily burdened domestically to maintain the home front.

The offer list has an indirect but substantial implication, too, for our Secretary of Treasury, Mr. Robert Anderson. For purposes of demonstration only, let me say that \$15 billion of foreign imports in 1959 in terms of domestic production, would represent a revenue take by the Treasury of about \$3 billion in taxes. And I hastily add, before the free trade colony accuses me of being anti-foreign-trade or anticoffee, or antirubber, et cetera, that I sincerely advocate trade among nations and to the maximum extent that may be profitable for

us. However, even though all our coffee is imported and it all comes free of duty, may I say that one can speak out on behalf of foreign trade and yet speak against the Foreign Trade Act without the least contradiction. I also include GATT in this context because that instrument is the method by which the trade agreement program manifests itself.

While much of last year's imported goods and merchandise was without question absolutely essential for our domestic needs, partially recognized by the fact that nearly half of our imports are duty free, it should be quite clear to everyone that there is real fire behind the smoke of growing pleas from American industry and labor and agriculture for a fair trade program particularly in the areas of competing finished goods imports.

For example, imports of finished consumer goods have risen over 40 percent since 1958 and 60 percent since 1957. They have doubled since 1956. Similarly, finished capital goods jumped 25 percent from 1958 to 1959.

Let us assume that in certain areas of manufacture, the United States, by means of fair and reasonable tariff regulation, could recapture a fair share of her own import market. Just what would this mean to us?

According to a recent study to this effect released by the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy it would mean, quote:

#### POSITIVE PROTECTIONISM A HYPOTHESIS BASED IN FACT

In 1959, \$15 billion of foreign imports flooded U.S. ports. For purposes of demonstration, assume that American producers had manufactured and supplied one-half of that value of imported goods. That would have provided \$7.5 billion of American production and, at the average rate of 20 percent, would have produced about \$1.5 billion of Federal tax revenue.

Here is what the American people might have received in the public and private sectors for those taxes:

1. In the area of defense it would purchase 300 additional ICBM Atlas missiles; or 100 of the newest B-58 bombers; or 13 new submarines of the Polaris type; or a fleet of 750 F106 all-weather fighter planes.

2. In educational facilities it would have provided: 3,000 new schools, containing 50,000 classrooms with a seating capacity for 1,500,000 boys and girls—more than enough to absorb our current nationwide requirements for 1.3 million new students; or

3. In the construction industry it would have: put our carpenters and bricklayers to work making 100,000 new homes valued at \$15,000 each for almost one-half million Americans; or laid down 1,500 miles of superhighway, enough to cross the entire country from our Canadian to Mexican borders.

This is what the U.S. citizen might have had on the tax incidence alone had domestic producers shared the domestic import market on a 50-50 basis with the foreign manufacturers.

In addition, and of far more significance, is what \$7.5 billion in hypothetical domestic production would have meant in terms of employment, sales, investment, research or growth. In terms of annual wages, jobs and man-hours alone it would approximate over \$5 billion received by over 1 million workers gainfully occupied for 2½ billion man-hours in 1959.

Modern, 1960 protectionism can bring to the American people some of these things. This is positive protectionism. This is morally honest protectionism. This is economically sound protectionism.

The American people have been led to believe by the Government as well as the metropolitan press with a hefty assist from a few well-known private organizations that trade and the Trade Act are one, indivisibly and inseparably woven. They go together like ham and eggs. No act, no trade. Millions of people we are told, will be unemployed without the trade program. But behind this superficial concern we must come to realize that it is not the program per se which employs the workers, but trade itself; and trade predated the act.

Actually the facts seem to support the conclusion that the trade we have had we enjoyed in spite of the act and furthermore because of the existence of this outdated legislation our balance-of-payments ledger is ending up in the red—the debit side, year after year. Note the rapid rise in imports during the past several years and compare them with our decreasing exports, the figures for which are readily obtainable from the Census Bureau of the Department of Commerce.

Since 1948 foreign imports of goods alone have totaled almost \$130 billion—foreign value only.

Simultaneously, the American people through the instrument of foreign aid have been called upon to support 70 foreign nations including those of our foreign competitors since the inauguration of the Marshall plan in 1948. This amounted to approximately \$85 billion.

It appears, too, that plans are well along for another Marshall plan—one for South America. And of course by the time that one is completed we shall, if there is anything left over in the Treasury, need one for the multinational continent of Africa. By then we may even need one for the United States.

In other words American business which provides about 25 percent of the United States budget revenue not only directly contributes to its own competition abroad in the form of financial aid and all that that entails—for example, productivity training, merchandising methods, plants, and machinery—but is called upon now dutifully and obediently to offer its markets, too.

To give away the golden eggs is one thing, but to give up the goose that lays them is quite another and that is just what we have been and are doing with our offer lists whenever GATT delegates gather.

We are offering the goose itself—our markets, the very blood and substance of our jobs and sales.

Take these away from us and the industrial heartland of this Nation will undergo an economic coronary which will shake us—and the foreign aid program and the free world to their foundation.

If this is what we want, the State Department could not have devised a more suitable instrument than GATT to bring it about.

Caught up in its own Machiavellian, water-on-both-shoulders policy of promising other GATT trading nations an unlimited domestic market here for the overflow of their booming industry on the one hand and then promising domestic industry and labor on the other that they are going to be tough at Geneva this year reminds me of a statement of Hawthorne's:

No man for any considerable period can wear one face to himself and another to the multitude, without finally getting bewildered as to which may be true.

The State Department's idea of getting tough will indeed be something to behold.

Will we be tough at Geneva by granting the foreign manufacturers tangible tariff reductions and further markets here in exchange for such specious concession by their diplomats as the mere suspension of additional tariff increases there? This we have done in the past.

While our tariff reductions at other GATT meetings were true dollars-and-cents concessions which created real sales here for the foreign producer, their meaningless concessions to us did not produce reciprocal or equivalent gains abroad for our steel, autos, or machinery.

They simply bluffed our GATT delegates at these international poker games by the simple ruse of promising the U.S. representatives that they would not further restrict those markets which we already held in their respective countries. This is what has come to be known as reciprocal trade—a negative commitment from them not to do for a positive commitment to do from us.

Accordingly they gave us the foreign markets which we already had in return for domestic markets and jobs which we had no right to give. Little wonder that the American producer shudders at the advent of a new GATT convention.

If ever this Congress and the American people become isolationists, God forbid, it would be caused more by the action and policies of the State Department than by those of our foreign friends who can be charged with nothing more than driving a hard bargain in the field of foreign trade. Would that our delegates were as skillful or as concerned for the interest and welfare of their own nationals as the foreign delegate is for his.

Let us get down to cases. Three such instances come to mind—meat, shoes, and brass products.

First. Foreign footwear imports skyrocketed 2,000 percent from 1949 to 1959. During this decade, imported footwear of all types—rubber and nonrubber—jumped from 3.6 million pairs to 80.5 million, while exports of American-made shoes dropped 35 percent over the same period, from 5.7 million pairs to less than 3.7 million. Since 1954 imports are estimated to have increased from 1 percent to over 10 percent of domestic production.

Nonrubber footwear imports last year increased 18 percent over 1958, or from 23 million pairs to over 28 million.

The average value per pair of men's leather shoes imported to that of our

exported pair is as \$4.46 is to \$5.47. This clearly indicates why foreign shoe imports have stomped over us, while our products are on the decline abroad.

According to a resolution adopted last year by the United Shoe Workers of America, AFL-CIO, which urged import regulation, if the present rate of increase in imports continues another 4 years "there would be more foreign shoes imported into the United States than are manufactured within the United States itself."

Second. The brass manufacturers who also produce copper products have been doubly jeopardized by the twin imports of 95 billion pounds of brass products and 105 billion pounds of copper products in 1959. This total of 200 million pounds of copper-brass product imports compares with only 21 million pounds a decade ago.

And, as with the case of shoes or a growing list of other American products, the export markets for our copper and brass goods has shriveled from 47 billion pounds during the past 10 years to 16 million during 1959.

Mr. T. E. Veltfort, managing director of the Copper & Brass Research Association, said before the Tariff Commission recently:

In modern times no nation has ever developed a sound and secure economy without strong basic industry in brass, steel, and aluminum. And any nation which permits its brass mills to stagnate and decline cannot expect to continue for any extended period of time as a powerful economic force in the world. (American Metal Market, June 28, 1960.)

Third. Rapidly rising imports leave untouched few American industries and few American products. Note for example, the effect on our meat industry. Beef plus live cattle imports last year amounted to an equivalent of more than 2 million head. Beef together with veal imports passed the 1-billion-pound mark in 1959 in dressed carcass weight equivalents.

Small wonder then that we are relegating our acreage to a second-class status vis-a-vis the other major trading nations of the world. Those 2 million head of cattle and beef equivalent last year displaced over 40 million domestic acres based on estimates of 20 acres of land per head.

In addition mutton and lamb imports from 1958 to 1959 increased from 17 million pounds to 44 million, and from 7 million pounds to 9 million respectively. And another one-third of a million acres were displaced here.

Parenthetically, wool imports according to estimates displaced an additional 75 million acres of rangeland. It is not so strange, therefore, that we are witnessing the modern American phenomenon known as the soil bank program which is a rather high-sounding and soothing semantical term for a shocking agricultural situation. How much more honest and accurate would it be frankly to tell the American farmer who has been brainwashed into believing that he is constantly overproducing, that foreign imports play a heavy role in this disgraceful situation.



If the State Department's callous GATT-foreign trade policies continue uncontrolled, the American farmers and ranchers should erect a huge tombstone over our vast, rich, and fertile western plains to read, as follows: "Here lies America's farm and cattle land—a silent sacrifice on the altar of free trade."

What can be done now to salvage something for industry, agriculture, and labor in the few legislative days remaining?

First. On January 21, 1960, I introduced H.R. 9841, a bill designed to adjust conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and their opposite numbers abroad with respect to the level of wages and working conditions in the production of articles imported into our domestic economy. This proposed legislation was drafted with the cooperation of Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, who introduced the bill in the Senate as S. 2882. Regrettably the House Ways and Means Committee has not seen fit to act over the past 7 months to release the necessary legislation over excessive imports contained within the proposed bill. We suggest that all concerned who have a stake in the problem of foreign competition bring their views immediately to the attention of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. WILBUR MILLS.

Second. We suggest a similar course of action on behalf of House Concurrent Resolution 512 in order to unfetter it from the same committee and put it to the test intended by its over 40 legislative sponsors from dozens of States. This sense-of-Congress resolution asks only that we (a) examine the effects on American industry of past imports before we (b) commit ourselves to further tariff cuts this coming winter in Geneva.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks the recent testimony of Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, before the Republican Party's resolution committee.

Mr. Strackbein's statement deals with the same problem, namely, the need for proper protection of American producers, manufacturers, farmers, and their workers against competition that will drive them out of business and employment:

#### TARIFF AND TRADE POLICY

(Statement of O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, before the Republican platform committee, Chicago, July 20, 1960)

The 1956 Republican platform contained the following paragraph with respect to foreign trade policy:

"Barriers which impede international trade and the flow of capital should be reduced on a gradual, selective, and reciprocal basis, with full recognition of the necessity to safeguard domestic enterprises, agriculture, and labor against unfair import competition. We proudly point out that the Republican Party was primarily responsible for initiating the escape clause and peril point provisions of law to make effective the necessary safeguards for American agriculture, labor, and business. We pledge faithful and expeditious administration of these provisions."

Since the adoption of this plank in 1956 changes of possibly far-reaching and un-

happy consequences in our foreign competitive position have broken through the placid surface of our self-assurance.

This country today faces a set of competitive factors that are stubbornly different from any we have ever faced before. There is little evidence that the peril to our industry, our agriculture, and our labor is either transient or superficial.

The trade policy of the past 25 years has been made obsolete by a series of domestic and foreign developments. It is now badly out of focus with the competitive realities of the world.

1. The leading foreign industrial nations have installed tens of billions of dollars worth of advanced machinery and equipment. They have adopted modern mass-production methods. They are improving their technology and are gravitating toward mass markets.

2. Their wages continue very low in relation to ours while the productivity gap between them and this country has narrowed visibly.

This combination of rapidly rising foreign productivity hand-in-hand with lagging wages has confronted us with loss of export markets and with the need of manufacturing abroad. At the same time it has exposed us to an increased flow of imports, particularly finished and semimanufactured items, against which there is now no effective official remedy. Industry after industry in the past 2 years has felt the rising tide of deadly import competition engulfing the market. The imports of manufactured products have doubled since 1956.

Because of the rising prosperity of the past year, the high consumer income and liberal consumer spending, distress has been kept from the factory door in many cases; and the fear in such instances is for the future rather than the present. In other instances there is present distress, attributed directly to import competition.

The remedy then would seem to be perpetual prosperity, assured by constant expansion and full employment. High wages would furnish the necessary consumer income as it has in the postwar years.

This formula would continue to work as it has in the past were the past conditions to continue. Unfortunately for the formula the conditions have changed. We are challenged from without, not (except in the Russian threat), as a matter of hostility but as a natural consequence of postwar rehabilitation, foreign aid, etc. This external factor is a new element in our economy. Unless we insulate ourselves against it in some reasonable degree we cannot hope to operate our domestic economy on the same basis as in the past 15 years.

Assuming no military outbreak, all presently proposed measures to right ourselves must necessarily fail because we cannot pull away from the encroaching competitive realities. This conclusion assumes the continued vigor of labor bargaining in this country; for this will prevent the catch up of foreign wages (even in terms of relative labor productivity). Should labor oppose the necessary protection against imports it must be prepared to moderate its demands for higher wages, better fringe benefits, etc. Otherwise it will strip this country of many industries that employ tens of thousands of workers.

If we are to increase our exports we must have prices that will help sell our goods, or services or credit terms or quality of goods that offset foreign advantages. In a world of trade rivalry we cannot assume that other countries will not also bestir themselves. They too can lengthen credit terms, reduce prices and offer high quality goods; and they are out to do it. In the race of increasing productivity they have outdone us with our help. The substitution of modern machinery for relatively backward equipment means

a greater leap in productivity than does the replacement of relatively modern machinery by more advanced models, as in this country.

If water is poured into a tapering glass the water rises faster with the first few ounces than with the next and the next. The broader and deeper the water becomes the less the water level rises with each equal increment. So it is with our productivity as we add more improved machinery. It has less effect in raising our level than the addition of an equal or even smaller amount in other countries.

Already over half our exports of agricultural products depend on some sort of Government assistance program or noncommercial factors. We subsidize both wheat and raw cotton some 30-35 percent in order to export the bushels and bales in large quantities. These subsidies in 1960 will cost the Treasury some \$500 million. Much of the exports under Public Law 480 is at special prices, for foreign currency or no currency.

In other words, the more we export of our agricultural surplus the heavier the Treasury burden and the less our net returns from exports. Thus our subsidized agricultural exports add to the weakening position of the dollar in the world.

With respect to industrial products we are also in an unenviable position. In many lines we are as surely and as deeply outpriced as in agricultural products. This should be expected since our general price level is no exception to the level of farm prices. In point of fact farm prices have been lagging for several years and many of them are well below parity. Parity with what? The answer is parity with industrial prices. This fact indicates that if our farm prices which are below parity in this country are well above world prices, our prices on industrial products, which are well above the farm parity level, should be expected to be above world prices.

If we then seek to reduce the cost of our industrial products, how can such a reduction be accomplished? Examine the possibilities: Automate? Other countries have the advantage over us in that field, as already explained. Moreover, automation leads to displacement of workers, in the short run. In the long run it has generally led to an increase in employment; but with foreign competitors waiting on our doorsteps this is another honored economic theory that may burst on impact with the new reality.

Increase the efficiency of labor? This is usually accomplished in any meaningful sense by the introduction of new machinery. This door is closed as a way of staying ahead of other countries, again, as already explained.

Reduce wages? Ask the leaders of American labor what their attitude would be.

Many alarms over imports have been sounded by American industrial leaders, labor organizations, and agricultural groups. They have seen the havoc worked by low-cost imports and have beaten the drums to awaken the country to the danger.

Yet too many of these complainants walk to the edge of the only remedy with fear and trepidation. After drawing the problem in compelling terms they back away and say "but tariffs are not the answer. Trade restrictions, such as tariffs and quotas, would be a step backward. Other countries would retaliate." They forget that we have run forward so far and so fast, that a few steps backward now would be better than a full retreat later.

Their fears of retaliation in any case are false and unfounded. These favorite fears have been so often voiced as a means of supporting the trade agreements program that few have stopped to consider their meaning.

Trade restrictions have been used more extensively by other countries since World War II than in any other period of history undoubtedly. Where was the retaliation? Did

we retaliate? No. We continued to reduce our tariff and we recognized the need of other countries. The diplomacy of the other countries saw to it that we understood the plight of their position. Because of or despite the restrictions adopted by them the afflicted countries have recovered and reached booming proportions in their trade.

Now we are in need of import regulation. Can we not explain that to the countries that we accommodated, in terms understandable by them? Why then should they retaliate against us?

We should make a true remedy available to each industry, including labor, that is seriously hurt by imports. This should not be in the form of a general tariff increase or import quotas applied willy-nilly; but it should be an instrumentality far superior to the useless one now on hand.

The remedy of today, consisting principally of the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act, has, in the words of a U.S. Senator, become a "hollow sounding board." With the minor exception of the very recent typewriter ribbon cloth, not a single new case in the past 17 months has found its way to the White House in the form of a recommendation for higher duty. About a dozen cases were disposed of during this period.

This record is in sharp contrast to the numerous assurances voiced over the past 25 years by three Presidents, every Secretary of State and sundry Under Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries, and other Cabinet members that it is not the intention of the Trade Agreements Act to injure American industry; and that should such injury nevertheless occur, there is a sure and prompt remedy. These assurances have not in fact been honored administratively.

What is needed is an escape clause that cannot be nullified by unsympathetic administration. It should be invoked when injury is demonstrated and should provide relief either in the form of an increased tariff or an import quota or a combination of the two. The clause should of course not be invoked to satisfy trivial complaints.

We suggest that this year's platform recognize the changed competitive position of this country and the implications of the massive shifts among the economic factors that have moved us into an unenviable corner.

More is needed than a pledge of faithful and expeditious administration of the escape clause and the peril point provisions of the law. This has in any case not been forthcoming. A change in the law is needed, for today an industry can have but the slightest hope of gaining a favorable recommendation from the Tariff Commission, and even less hope of support from the President. This fact points to the responsibility of Congress in the case. All the fair words of the Executive in proposing extensions of the Trade Agreements Act and all the fair words of political platforms will remain meaningless and will be nullified unless a drastic change is made in the administration of the remedies provided by Congress.

Failure to face this problem squarely would represent evasion of one of the greatest issues of today and tomorrow.

#### WHY SCHOLARS IN POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time today to talk on three subjects. The first subject is entitled "Why Scholars in Politics." The second phase of that presentation will be entitled "There Is a Difference." And

then I shall conclude with a statement on the public service of David Mearns of the Library of Congress.

#### WHY SCHOLARS IN POLITICS

One of the most persistent problems facing political man has been his age-old search for the proper relationship between the philosopher and the king; between the man of ideas and the man of power.

Plato characterized a fairly common Greek answer to this problem by saying that the ultimate solution was to be found in the uniting of the philosopher and the king in the same person.

Unless, either philosophers become kings in their countries, or those who are now kings and rulers come to be sufficiently inspired with a genuine desire for wisdom; unless, that is to say, political power and philosophy meet together, while the many natures who now go on their several ways in the one or other direction are forcibly debarred from doing so, there can be no rest from troubles for states, nor yet for all mankind; nor can this commonwealth ever till then see the light of day and grow to its full stature.

Though Aristotle was somewhat more moderate in his views, he too insisted that the men of power seek the advice of men of ideas before proceeding with any scheme or project of great moment.

In our own rich national heritage it can be said that the ideals of both Plato and Aristotle have been served. For surely the Founding Fathers were a collection of scholars. Included in their number were professors and college presidents. And those who were not actively engaged in pedagogy were nonetheless representative of the highly educated and thoughtful leaders of their time and, therefore, could be called scholars and students of government. They had schooled themselves in political philosophy through study and experience in practical politics. In contemporary terms, they were as truly philosophers or intellectuals as they were politicians. Fortunately for the future of the Republic they saw that thinkers must be doers and doers must be thinkers.

And this tradition has been carried on ever since. The close relationship between Lincoln and the scholars of his time and since his time is well known to us all. Senator Robert La Follette called upon 55 top professors from the University of Wisconsin to aid him in the development of his "Wisconsin idea." And, in more recent times, both major parties have utilized a number of academicians in their administrations. Seymour Martin Lipset, in his book, "Political Man," points out that more intellectuals have occupied high administrative posts in the Eisenhower administration than in any previous administration.

Because of my early experience as a teacher, I have always been keenly aware of the great possibilities and importance of using the talents and experience of educators; especially those who are in the political science, history, and social science fields.

As a member of the Iowa Legislature I counseled often with educators in the secondary, college, and university levels. They have always been very helpful and in many ways made a real contribution

in helping to resolve many of the problems that confronted me at that time.

Since coming to the U.S. Congress, my experience with some 70 students, educators, and professors from the University of Iowa and from the other colleges in Iowa, who have come here to visit and work in my office as part of a program we called a "Week in Washington," has confirmed my conviction derived from my earlier experience in the Iowa Legislature.

These people were guests in our home and came to us under this program sponsored cooperatively with the citizenship clearinghouse of the University of Iowa, directed by Dr. Robert Ray.

The intimate association with these students and professors convinced me that the understanding and interest of the so-called intellectuals and scholars in our system is pretty well grounded in the theory of our Government. Though lacking experience and close association with political leaders, these people almost universally agreed that this experience was as invaluable to them as it was to me.

Thus, I have found mutual advantage in this association.

Also, my experience with professors and students who have done basic research, recommended legislation, and advised me on various subjects and issues before the Congress has been extremely helpful and rewarding.

In one instance, my research team of university students, at the University of Iowa, under the direction of Dr. Russell Ross, which had been working for 2 years on the problems of small business came up with five specific recommendations for a change in the law. They were invited to and did give testimony before the Select Committee on Small Business of the Small Business Committee of the House.

The committee and the House passed four of the five recommendations they presented.

This demonstrates that these people can, if properly challenged and encouraged, make a real and meaningful contribution.

Based on this particular experience and all the others that I have had with professors and students, I would not hesitate to recommend to every Member of Congress who has an educational institution in his district to investigate the help, counsel, and advice that may be available to him there.

I have come to the conclusion that there is a vast reservoir of specialized knowledge and experience in the 2,011 colleges and universities across the land which has barely been tapped in the pursuit of a more efficient and effective Government. Both major parties have drawn from the top of this vast reservoir, but neither has really utilized it to its greatest advantage.

In 1957, however, things began to change.

The then chairman of the Republican National Committee, Meade Alcorn, called together a number of the Nation's intellectuals from all walks of life to boldly face the awesome challenge of the fearful years ahead.



This effort was formalized in the Republican Committee on Program and Progress. Its chairman was a brilliant young business executive, Charles Percy, and its staff director, a Stanford professor, Dr. Cornelius P. Cotter.

The report which this committee issued was a refreshing and straightforward approach to the pressing political problems of our time.

For the first time since the issuing of the Federalist Papers the publishing industry found the work of a political party significant enough to issue a trade book edition.

Over 50,000 of these so-called Percy reports were published and the supply is now nearly exhausted.

The people thus made manifest their desire for a serious study of contemporary issues.

Partly in response to this venture, and partly because of the obvious need to make a systematic effort to utilize the vast talents of the academic world at a time when the Nation desperately needed these talents, Senator THURSTON MORRIS, chairman of the national committee, in collaboration with the national committee's national director, A. B. "AB" Herman, established the arts and sciences division at the Republican National Committee.

Prof. Cornelius P. Cotter, on leave from Stanford University, was selected as the first director of this division.

It was under his direction that the program of the arts and sciences first took shape.

After Professor Cotter left the national committee in June to accept an appointment as assistant staff director of the Civil Rights Commission, Prof. Arthur L. Peterson, formerly of Wisconsin State and newly appointed director of the Institute of Practical Politics at Ohio Wesleyan University, became the director of the division.

Under his leadership the division has expanded its operation, and has become an integral part of the 1960 campaign operation.

Now what actually has the arts and sciences division attempted to do? It must be stated at the outset that, when this division was instituted, it was partially an exploratory and an experimental thing.

But the response has been extraordinarily good. From 645 colleges and universities the names of 4,200 friendly faculty members have poured in.

Both Republican- and Democratic-oriented college presidents have responded by stating that they are deeply impressed with what the Republican National Committee is doing with this program to stimulate interest in government and politics.

As newspapermen analyze the several score of academic people who are active in the Kennedy campaign, it is interesting to note by way of contrast, that over 4,000 academic leaders stand ready and waiting for their marching orders to contribute their specialized knowledge, experience, and skills to the Republican campaign at the State, congressional, and national levels.

Already hundreds have asked for specific assignments and hundreds are ac-

tively engaged in campaigns across the country.

A number of these intellectuals have contributed to a book-length series of papers on national defense; still others played vital roles as staff assistants to the platform committee at the national convention.

But, that is not all. Every day, cards, letters, telephone calls, and telegrams continue to deluge the arts and sciences division as well as the scholars for Nixon-Lodge headquarters.

Administrators and faculty members from colleges and universities continue to applaud the national committee's efforts to encourage and involve them in the politics of this campaign.

Two points should be noted: First, buried once and for all is the old erroneous theory that college campuses are the domain of the Democratic Party.

Second, a new era of life and growth is in store for the Republican Party and for its service to the Republic.

Since it is true that our Government is more important to more people in our country than ever before in the history of our Nation and because of our position in the world, it is important that we understand all of the basic philosophies thoroughly and harness the best talent we have to the task before us.

I want to commend the trend extant in both political parties which has encouraged discussion and participation in all our educational institutions whose principal purpose is, I am sure, to present America with an active, interested, and understanding citizen dedicated to the great purpose and ideal of freedom and a people who will do their all to achieve a more perfect union.

In this we will recognize the truth of what Edmund Burke reminded us when he said, "That government is best which teaches its people to govern themselves."

One final thought. The goal of the Republican National Committee's arts and sciences division is greater involvement of the Nation's intellectuals in practical politics.

But the goal goes far beyond partisan politics.

What is envisaged here is a nation utilizing every ounce of its intellectual as well as its material resources in the building of a better life for its people and in the life and death struggle with world communism.

I have tried and want to emphasize the importance of this great movement and the attention we are giving American intellectuals who participate in the active rolls of the Republican Party.

It has an immediate significance as well as a long-range importance and value to my party and, through my party, to our country and the great goals it has for all the people.

So that the people of our country may further discuss and better understand the difference between the kind of leadership and promise offered by the two parties, I would like now to turn my attention to this question and suggest that "there is a difference."

#### THERE IS A DIFFERENCE

What government does or does not do within a free society is a direct reflection of the plenitude or lack of rea-

soned public discussion of the great issues of our times. It is my humble hope that with this discussion on the theme of "There Is a Difference" I can stimulate some thinking on some problems and issues that are basic to our understanding of the political challenges.

I should like to begin by saying that one of the great political myths is the claim that there are no differences between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party.

Such an understanding simply does not square with political reality. Worse still, it seems to me that too often such an approach is the conscience satisfying escape with which the uninformed and the indifferent eligible voters console themselves in order to avoid the trouble of making a thorough study of the candidates and the issue or even going to the polls to vote.

It is, in fact, the unprepared minds' out from all further political bother, discussion, study, and controversy.

Once the fellow who has no opinion about anything and does not want to be annoyed convinces himself that there is no difference between the two parties, he has given himself the excuse-extraordinary for any further involvement in the politics of his country and the issues that plague it.

There is no use anyway, he says, since whether you vote this way, or whether you vote that way, it all comes to the same thing.

It is for him the ideal device for not having to inform himself on politics and the problems that engulf him, his family, his neighbors, and the world.

He has now furnished himself with a pat and easy retreat from any and all tests of his responsibility as a citizen, a voter, and a member of the political community.

He has reduced himself to a political cipher.

I call this the escape-from-freedoms-responsibility school of political psychology.

I am a Republican because I believe I can best serve my country politically within the confines of the broad principles it seeks to represent.

I am intensely partisan because I have deep convictions about the effective role of active party membership.

About those who wish to escape from freedom's responsibility—a painfully numerous class of political inactives—I have no party complaints whatever since it is an affliction and/or condition that both parties must contend with.

Surely one does have sympathy for the harassed and bewildered voter confronted with the conscience-searching problem of making a decision in an age of profound and world-shaking crises.

It is human to want to slough off a burden on the mind and on the conscience, which is a voluntary burden of free citizens anyhow, and behind which there is no compulsion and for the neglect of which there is no concrete and immediate penalty.

But there is a penalty in the end that all must suffer.

So, let us not delude ourselves, because there is a guilt on those who fail to vote.

The guilt is compounded when excuses are seized upon that have no basis in truth.

Of all the excuses that I have heard—and there are many—such as “politics is a dirty business,” “Who can believe what they say?” “I have my own troubles,” “I just don’t like politics,” the most insidious is that politics, especially in 1960, makes no sense because there are no differences in the philosophies or the ideologies of the two political parties.

The guilt is blackest on the political commentators, the so-called experts and many political leaders themselves of the past and present who should know better and many of whom do know better, and who gave rise to the myth in the first place and have fed and fostered it.

To say that there are no differences between the two parties is to fail to see and understand the real makeup of our political structure.

If there is no difference, then, in terms of their publicity and public relations efforts, the two parties are guilty of the greatest hoax in the history of domestic politics.

It is my contention that the difference between the two parties is very real indeed.

The difference is indeed the difference between black and white, but it is not yet the compelling difference that exists, say, between our system and the Soviets. It is because apperceiving this difference involves some thought that the myth of the sameness is made possible. For me, as for many Americans, the difference between the parties is evident not only in the way each group thinks out the solutions to identical problems; it is evident, I maintain, even in their physical appearance as their conduct came through on the television screen from Los Angeles and then from Chicago.

It is a difference that is hard for some to define since both had the quality of prosperity, well-being, patriotic endeavor, and an impressive and wholesome Americanism. There were our people—both parties—but I think the evidence was patent that the Democratic Party performed, as has been noted in the press, in the manner of a well-heeled tourist convention out for the maximum of fun and excitement and a minimum of wrestling with the gravity of issues that threaten the happiness and the peace of mankind. The Democratic Convention was by no means devoid of a sense of purpose. But whatever sense of purpose it had, for the most part, was secondary to the principle motivation, which was that of having a riotously good time and doing a lot more cheering than thinking. They wanted some idea, some slogan, some cliché to applaud, and some personality to raise the roof off for, and sing hosannahs to. The Democratic Party Convention wanted to take the Ark of the Covenant and the gods in the temple and go out and dance in the streets with them.

The Democratic Party Convention in Los Angeles was a “Hurrah—the-gang’s-all-here” convention.

But the unbiased public for the most part agreed that was hardly the atmos-

phere characterized by the Republican Party Convention in Chicago.

Here, too, there was controversy and conflict, enthusiasm and disappointment, defeat and victory.

But the visual and demonstrable evidence to the eyes of the beholder in tens of millions of homes throughout the land made it significant that this was a convention dedicated to a program of solemn tasks.

It, too, after the American political habit of ebullience, loved to cheer and to applaud, to march and to wave flags and banners, pictures and slogans.

But the overall effect of the Republican Party Convention in Chicago was one of grave concern with the issues of our time and the selection of a leadership that would for the next decade determine directly the destiny of the United States and the free world.

Just as the Republican Convention of 100 years ago, the Republican Party Convention in Chicago this year was, as perhaps my partisan eyes insist on seeing it: an important page in world history.

The reason I emphasize these seemingly superficial and surface differences is because they reflect the substantive differences between the two parties, and because here was something made real, intimate, graphic over the television before the whole Nation.

Thus, I have nothing to back me up but what those who witnessed the two conventions in their own homes actually saw.

This distinction between the two party conventions, enthusiasm for enthusiasm’s sake in the opposition’s camp and order and restraint, without repression in the Republican camp, is a psychological approach to the great differences that make the majority leadership of the two parties as unlike as day and night.

Behind this seemingly surface difference is a profound difference in principle and integrity, in the quest for truth and somber dedication, that lights up like a flaming revelation the present status and the past history of the Republican Party, and the current showmanship and past stunts and devices, of the opposition party.

Of course, the Democratic Party would not have the appeal and the power that it has had if it did not, sincerely, seek to overcome the massive omnipresence of the Soviet challenge.

The Democratic Party wants to win out against the Soviet plague that afflicts us, and the complex of domestic ills and inadequacies as all loyal Americans want to win out against them.

But, the opposition party, conforming to its history and the plunging errors of its past, wants to do it by a vast policy of spending treasury dollars as if they were confetti to be scattered before a strong wind to a multitude of reaching hands in complete indifference to inflation, or prudence, or the morrow, or how little the widely scattered dollars today will mean to the imminent world of tomorrow.

What is abhorrent and ugly, even dishonorable, to the mind of a Republican on the question of inflation, is merely

normal and practical and routine to the mind of the great part of the Democratic Party. I do not mean that the other party has the fiduciary morals of a pickpocket. But to the thinking of the Republican Party the pensions, both private and public, of some 16 million Americans now living, is a sacred trust on the level of the relationship between say, a banker and his client, a merchant and his customer.

It is a matter of business honor and a question of delivery and performance on a solemn contract.

But if a pensioner’s dollar at the hour of retirement is worth a dollar; and 5 years or a decade or so later, his pension dollar is worth only 59 cents, then the financial powers of the country have cheated him out of the difference.

It is true that the money out of which he has been cheated has not gone to enrich someone in particular, as in the case of a pickpocket who steals an unwary working girl’s Saturday pay envelope.

But the pensioner surely has been deceived and taken in by the propaganda of compassion for the common man that made him the victim of this legislative con game.

He has been taught to think that the political party that initiated this pension legislation is his very particular friend, only to wake up a decade later to discover he has been and is the victim of a vicious kind of political demagoguery.

To me it seems a matter of basic honor that a pension dollar ought to be worth, throughout its lifetime, what it was worth at the hour of the individual’s retirement.

Anything less than that is, as I see it, a policy of fiduciary defalcation.

The difference between the Republican and the Democratic Party is that the Democratic Party economists and apologists see this as the normal and omniscient operation of the laws of government, finance, and economics.

The Republican Party, believing in a far more difficult but ruggedly honest solution of old-age pensions, wants the dollar to remain clean, sure, uninflated, and meaningful in the life of the 16 million Americans who depend on it.

It is not a question of “Hurrah! Let’s pass the legislation,” but a question of making sure that the legislation does what it says it does.

In a basic sense I deny, as a statistical untruth, that there are—actually—more Democrats in our body politic than Republicans.

What the Democrats have is an artificial popularity stimulated by the immediate promise of dollars in the hand, through fabulous Government spending.

This is an irresistible voter appeal in some quarters, where more prudent policies with better promise of success in the longer run are more difficult to communicate in the pressing heat of political campaigning.

The wiser policy that builds on strong foundations is more difficult to explain.

The showmanship of eloquence is easier and more crowd pleasing if you promise to put money in everybody’s



pocket right now, even if, substantively, the promise is hardly even a half truth. For quick dollars are cheap dollars and become a debased currency.

That is not only the story today but that has been the story throughout Democratic Party history.

There are those of us even now who can still remember the great campaigns and the even greater showmanship and appeal of presidential candidate William Jennings Bryan.

What was true then is true today. It is the pattern of our political history and shows up the deep roots of the differences between the two parties.

In the election of 1896, the Democrats demanded the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1.

But the Republican Party demanded the retention of the gold standard.

The Republican victory led to the Gold Standard Act of 1900.

If history has shown anything, it is that the Democratic Party went overboard on that issue.

Yet, presidential candidate Bryan roused the Democratic Convention in Chicago to a fever pitch, and won the plaudits of millions, with such typical Democratic oratory as this: "You shall not," he said, "press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

Even though Bryan lost there is no doubt that this kind of language must have been pretty passionate stuff for the American audiences of that day.

I insist that fundamentally the picture has not changed one iota.

Whether the argument is about cheap coins or cheap solutions.

Whether it is a question of labor law, agricultural policy, foreign aid, or education.

Whether it is legislation for medical aid for the aged or civil rights.

Whether it is veterans or veterinarians.

When the Democratic Party approaches the issue, it does it with a shout and a hurrah.

They came to Washington in the thirties to do the country over, and they would have made it over, in fact did make it over in some parts that cannot now be retrieved, but for the restraining influence of a handful of Republicans who held the line like a rearguard action.

And they held it because, I am happy to acknowledge, they had the cooperation and the collaboration here and there of a courageous company of Democrats.

But they were Democrats who saw the Republican light.

They were Democrats who abandoned the Democratic philosophy.

They were the Democrats who saw in the famous hundred days more than a hundred infamous mistakes that convulsed the country in a perpetual circus of flipflops.

What differentiates the Republicans from the Democrats, as parties in recent years, is that a certain wing of the Democrats institutionally have a tradition of going overboard.

As they went overboard on silver in 1896 so they have a tendency to go overboard on soft money today.

An examination of the two platforms in 1960 indicates that there are strong differences and even a radical conflict in basic operational ideology between the two. This is not to say for a moment, however, that the goals are not the same.

The differentiations are not subtle at all. They are broad. But they are differentiations of degree, so much so, that the Democratic point of view taken in toto, can be described as extreme.

It can be described as radical. It can be described as going overboard. It is just too, too much.

I hesitate to say this but I am finally pressed to the conviction that the Democratic Party policymakers in recent years are willing to surrender their political integrity for the sake of a quick and easy, a definite and opportunistic political coup.

I say they go overboard and you say cite the cases, give us the evidence.

Well, here it is—the Democratic Party went overboard with the National Recovery Act—the NRA in 1933 which the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional in 1935.

Here was a device to make the country over. They were bent on giving us an economic totalitarian dictatorship within a political democracy and, of course, it could not work even if the Supreme Court had not declared it unconstitutional.

It was an act that went overboard because in one fell swoop it provided, under certain conditions, for the suspension of the antitrust laws.

This outlandish, anti-American, hopelessly alien NRA pushed itself into the workman's pay envelope.

It elbowed into every marketplace in the country. The NRA fixed minimum wages which might have become maximum wages.

The NRA gave the President the power to fix blanket codes for those industries which did not voluntarily prepare their own.

The NRA established price arrangements.

The NRA strangled the American economy until at long last the Supreme Court strangled the NRA.

The Democratic Party went overboard with the AAA—the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.

Here was something for the history books. It actually destroyed crops that had been planted. It applied the theory of "plow 'em under" and "kill the little pigs" as a basis for farm prosperity.

And it paid out of the Federal Treasury several hundred million dollars for a kind of legalized vandalism.

This time the Democratic Party not only went overboard but it tied a heavy weight on the feet of the American economy to hold it down.

What good it did, if any, was as artificial and as unnatural as a fish wearing horseshoes.

Everybody wanted to help the farmer and everybody wants to help him now.

But this certainly was not the plan for it and its stark and dismal failure as a policy is not of the trademarks of the Democratic Party.

The country thanked God for the Supreme Court which declared the AAA unconstitutional in 1936.

The Democratic Party went overboard, when deliberately and by careful legislative design, it abandoned the gold standard—I say unnecessarily—back in 1934 with the Gold Reserve Act.

This did permanent and vicious violence to our country's fiduciary integrity at home and abroad.

The idea was to create a rise in prices. The value of the dollar was fixed at 59.66 cents in terms of its former parity.

The intent, to be sure, was inflationary and so was the result although other Democratic fiduciary policies also helped to debase the American dollar.

Certainly, what I have said so far gives some indication of how broad and how deep are the differences between the two political parties.

The Republican Party as a party would no more advocate the AAA or the NRA or the abandonment of the gold standard than it would advocate making Khrushchev chairman of the board of the First Boston Corp.

But history is rich in evidence. And there is more.

Perhaps no act in the history of this century so far is as shocking an example of the Democratic Party's tendency to go overboard as the attempt to pack the Supreme Court.

How can that be defended?

And I do not arrogate all the sense of shame and dismay to the Democratic Party.

Not a few Democrats and—in the end—perhaps the whole Democratic Party was shocked just as much as we Republicans were.

Only since the Democratic Party perpetually goes overboard and then tries to retrieve itself it takes longer for the sense of shock to travel from the point of impact to the brain.

It must be said in justice to my, the Republican Party, that it sees before the fact only what the Democratic Party sees after the catastrophe has struck. Then the Democratic Party must be either bailed out of its bankrupt, headlong, foolhardy judgment by the Supreme Court, or by a massive public indignation, or by its own remorse and contrition.

Some of you may say, but all this is old hat and ancient history and has been chewed over again and again.

And so it has. But if we are talking about the differences between the two parties we must draw upon these dramatic examples that give us the face of the recent leadership in the Democratic Party. And it is the face of a party which seeks solutions through well-intentioned but unwise radicalism and popular extremes. On the other hand stands the Republican Party as a party which seeks solutions by sound appraisal and thoughtful, considered and effective action.

I would be the last to deny that sometimes—sometimes, after a lot of wild shooting in all directions—the Democratic Party does hit the bull's-eye, does make a 10-strike, does hit the jackpot.

I would be the last to contend that all the legislation they have sponsored and helped to enact—often with a lot of Republican Party collaboration—was just so much socialism. I would be the last to contend that all the legislation that derives from the Democratic Party leadership and Democratic Party initiative and advocacy lacked sound planning—at least after a lot of false starts and often unabashed demagoguery on the part of some.

But the basic record of the opposition party—its conventions, its legislation in toto, its campaigning, its platforms—is a record overburdened by and interlaced with political hysteria. This is not to impugn their motives, or charge that their sympathy for the so-called common man and the so-called forgotten man was all one solid piece of hypocrisy.

Much of it is deeply felt and genuine. It is rich in concern for the special interest groups in the large metropolitan areas of the Nation.

The Democratic Party hierarchies' difficulty today is that their election techniques and their brilliant capacity to appeal with poignant skill to the heaviest mass of the voting population often outruns their essential integrity and certainly their ability to deliver what they so easily and eloquently promise.

The Republican Party by contrast treats its platforms and the language of its leadership as an honest borrower treats a promissory note.

This is a solemn contract made with the people of the United States.

Great aspirations may be indicated, but a promise is one's bounden word and a promise is a promise.

It is this rugged integrity, this austerity in the matter of promises of legislative largess by the Republican Party to this mass of voters and that group of petitioners for legislative reform that gave the Republican opposition the basis for one of their greatest political myths.

This is the myth that the Democratic Party stands for the common man and all the people, while the Republican Party has for its special darling the so-called economic royalists and the malefactors of great wealth.

When is that canard ever going to cease?

The Democratic Party election technique takes a special glee and delight in selecting the administration of William McKinley to satirize current Republican leadership for the alleged hidebound, archaic, and brutal principles of indifference to the workingman and the unfortunate poor.

They make a big platform joke of charging this or that Republican candidate with being to the "right of McKinley."

And all this becomes part of the vast general charge that the Republican Party is the friend only of the banker, the real-estate mortgagor, the manufacturer, the pawnbroker, and the exploiter.

Well, let us look at McKinley.

I hold it entirely just to consider McKinley as indeed part of the Republican Party record.

Republican Party history cannot repudiate him, and neither do I.

Well, what about McKinley? I will tell you.

When McKinley was a young lawyer, his biographers tell us, his—I quote—"most interesting case" was that of a group of Massillon miners, imprisoned for riot in 1876 during one of the periodic violent strikes in the coal-mining industry.

I quote from the recent Pulitzer prize-winning Margaret Leech biography. She writes:

McKinley was in sympathy with the workers' grievances, and undertook a case that had aroused much prejudice in the community. He succeeded in getting all the offenders released except one.

Then comes the additional fact that McKinley—I quote—"refused to accept payment from the impoverished strikers."

This was the rightist McKinley who is the Democratic Party's symbol for alleged Republican Party antipathy to the workingman.

It was McKinley when he was Governor of Ohio who, for my money, did more in his day, for enlightened labor legislation, than a whole covey of his contemporary Democratic Governors.

I read from the same biography:

The labor laws enacted by the legislature bore unmistakable signs of McKinley's direct influence.

The acts for the protection of railroad and streetcar employees from accident and exposure responded to the suggestions of his inaugural.

A bill was also passed to fine employers for preventing their workers from joining unions.

McKinley took an especially keen interest in a new industrial arbitration bill, which was founded on the pioneering act of Massachusetts and closely followed recommendations that he himself had made in Congress.

It is a matter of history that against the urgings of Mark Hanna, McKinley refused a Cabinet post—Postmaster General—to Henry C. Payne because Payne had been a railroad lobbyist and an enemy of labor.

Labor in McKinley's own time and during great labor crises was itself often warm and cordial to the Republican President.

This is not to deny that the Democratic Party candidate in McKinley's time had the endorsement of the great consolidating unions.

But labor bosses do not—then or today—necessarily always represent the best interest of labor.

Their endorsement of the opposition to McKinley hardly justifies categorizing McKinley as a symbol of injustice to the workingman.

There were periods of great prosperity during the McKinley era.

This made it possible to charge the President with being the friend of the moneyed interests and big business.

Yet, it was McKinley who in a strategic and important letter of acceptance wrote savagely of the great combinations of business.

I quote verbatim from his acceptance letter. He wrote:

They are dangerous conspiracies against the public good and should be made the subject of prohibitory or penal legislation.

These are hardly the words of a presidential candidate buddying up to predatory wealth.

McKinley's successor in the White House, Theodore Roosevelt, made so compelling an impact that even the most irresponsible demagogues in the Republican opposition failed—to this day—to deprive him of his glory as a "trust-buster."

This Roosevelt was hardly a radical, and it is he who so accurately helps us recognize the role of the Republican Party in our two-party system, the role of neither being pellmell for one side or the other, but of being outstandingly for justice to the whole economy, to the whole people, to the interests of the Nation.

This means for labor when it is in the right and against big business, with judicial vigor, when it is in the wrong.

It means being for the poor only when they are right and not simply because they are poor.

It means being against the rich not because they are rich but only when and if they are in the wrong.

The Republican Party is not a party of class but a party of justice and the party of reason and the party of sound sense, even to the point of unpopularity.

On the question of the public welfare it was Theodore Roosevelt who reached boldly beyond any legislation then apparent in a Democratic administration for the sake of what has become known as the common man.

In March of 1918 Theodore Roosevelt came out fighting in his demands for a system of old-age, sickness, and unemployment insurance.

He came out for public housing.

And he came out for a whole gamut of other reforms.

May I repeat this lest I be misunderstood or fail to give it due emphasis.

I say Theodore—I repeat, Theodore Roosevelt, before the New Deal had even been heard of—in 1918—came out for policies that the New Deal later adopted.

And I emphasize with neon lights, if I may, that the difference between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party is powerfully manifest in precisely the handling by the two parties of these same issues.

The difference, I submit, is the difference between black and white.

It is all the difference between horse-sense and hysteria.

Theodore Roosevelt, a decade, two decades before his famous namesake, did not present his welfare program in the ugly spirit of a class war.

Theodore Roosevelt did not present his welfare program with a great roar and shout of "making the country over."

There was no such business as rewriting, downgrading, or undermining constitutional principles that happened not to conform to the excitement of the moment.

There was no such thing as debilitating and adulterating the Supreme Court of the United States so that the Executive could have his way in spite of the Constitution.



The program that Theodore Roosevelt espoused—Roosevelt the Republican—was the program that found plenty of room to operate within our constitutional system and without dredging up the notions of a disenfranchised and exploited and enslaved American "proletariat."

Thus, I repeat, there are differences and this is one of them.

I have named McKinley whom the Democratic Party speech writers have traduced, and I have named Theodore Roosevelt whom they mostly ignore.

Let us add Charles Evans Hughes to point up the glaring and wholly vicious unkindness of perpetually presenting the Republican Party in the image of a creature of big business and an enemy of the plain people and the working man.

It is a statistic of history that before the end of Charles Evans Hughes' second term of Governor of New York the Hughes name was on no less than 56 statutes for the benefit of labor.

A publication called Legislative News, a union labor organ in New York appraised the Hughes contribution to the laboring man's happiness and security.

This publication wrote that the Hughes labor reforms included "many of the best labor laws ever enacted in this or any other State." The publication added:

Now, that Governor Hughes has retired from politics the fact can be acknowledged, without hurting anybody's political corns, that he was the greatest friend of labor laws that ever occupied the Governor's chair at Albany.

Charles Evans Hughes was certainly one of the four or five greatest Republican Party leaders in the history of party politics in the United States.

It was Governor Hughes who stopped public power give-away attempts in New York and made private companies pay for what they got.

But what Hughes did for labor, what Theodore Roosevelt did for the people in his curtailing of the power of the trusts, what McKinley even before them did for the "common man" before the phrase had even been dreamed up, was never presented to the American people in the politically honkytonk display style with which the more radical wings of the Democratic Party present the New Deal.

It was unaccompanied by shouting and hurrahs.

It was valid legislation for a valid cause and it is legislation that remains unchanged on the statute books.

Republican legislation did not go overboard.

The Wagner Labor Relations Act is in its essence no doubt a good act.

But the difference between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party is that if the Wagner Labor Relations Act had been authored by the Republican Party, which also believed and believes in prolabor reform, it would have stood the test of time.

If the Wagner Labor Relations Act of 1935 had been fathered by my party, the Republican Party, the modifications and the alterations of the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 would have been obviated.

It would have been right in the first place. And it would not then have been necessary in 1959 to enact the even more

drastic Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act—or the Landrum-Griffin Act, as it is called.

I think Republican leadership would have foreseen corruption and prevented it.

This is just a speculation and I may not be absolutely right in it.

But, I submit, as a difference between the two parties, that when the Republican leaders draft a bill they mean it to operate and to work effectively and successfully from the beginning.

They do not mean the bill to answer full blown any immediately pressing current of hot and emotional opinion that needs later to be modified when passions have calmed.

Republican legislation is legislation that avoids going overboard.

This is my thesis for the explanation of the differences between the two parties.

What matters now in the presidential campaign and for this hour is a judgment as to which of the two philosophies of government better fit the crisis we are in.

The choice is as much if not more as between the two parties—Republican and Democratic—as between personalities who represent the parties and who will project that thinking upon the policies of the United States in the next 4 years.

In the past, the overboard, shotgun method of approach was applied by the Democratic Party and its leadership, to almost exclusively domestic issues.

There were some startling adventures in the foreign field that did not invariably end for the good of America and the free world.

What we see today is a premonition of the back of the world being broken over the massive world cleavage between the Communist slave concept and the concept of a free world for free men.

We could, in the past, afford mistakes like the NRA and the AAA and the abandonment of the gold standard and even the horrors of inflation.

We could even put up with the attack on the integrity of the Supreme Court since in the end all these mistakes were either nipped-in-the-bud or modified or exposed and swept into nothingness.

But this is the age of the atom and today the shotgun and overboard method of seeking solutions—the method of trying everything and seeing which works and which does not—is outmoded.

It is not only outmoded; it is catastrophically perilous.

We cannot afford errors that may sweep the world into an atomic war.

We cannot afford errors that may vitiate, or enfeeble, the American dollar.

We cannot take chances with the American economy by probably brilliantly conceived but hopelessly impractical schemes dreamed out of some textbooks by some of the more extreme liberals of our college professors and political advisers who think they know all about theory but little about the facts of life.

We cannot take chances with a theory of government by propaganda wherein the extreme liberals of the Democratic

Party critics charge alleged missile gaps and then willy-nilly propose the all-American solution of spending a lot more billions of dollars to close a gap that never existed.

Is there a problem in education? Spend more money.

Is there a problem in agricultural surpluses? Spend more money.

Is there a problem in medical aid? Spend more money.

Is there a problem in defense? Spend more money.

The Republican Party—if you will pardon my partisan point of view—has come upon the world stage with a new and fresh and dynamic brace of leadership.

It is not just youth and vigor, but youth and vigor with a background of experience, ability, and temperament.

It is a leadership that is reaching out to all interested Americans who believe we have not failed to see or tried to meet the challenge of this age and to discover what it needs to do to set up a vast complex of goals about all of which it seems to feel painfully—and youthfully—uncertain.

It is a leadership that has already been tried and tested and made good.

It is a leadership that has informed itself on the very combat front of world politics—in the United Nations—in the executive department and in the Senate of the United States.

This is not to say that the Democratic leadership may not work out to the good—but who knows?

Here I have before me the solid evidence of current history that the proposed Republican leadership is moving in a path with which it is practically and by experience familiar.

Republican leadership knows what it is doing and it knows where it wants to go.

Republican leadership is not harassed into a state of hysteria about defense when, as we have just seen, in no more than a single day this administration made five significant and historic advances in space progress—five.

It can be stated like a postulate in simple arithmetic that the United States now leads the Soviet Union 25 to 7 in successful space shots.

They are ahead of us in the exploration of space around the moon. They are ahead of us in the matter of shooting sheer weight into the heavens.

But the sum total reveals the United States in a position the Soviet scientists have yet to match and the overall picture leaves them behind us.

The United States discovered two radiation belts around the earth.

The United States gaged the effect of solar explosions on the earth's magnetic field.

The United States beamed a recorded voice from space.

The United States photographed the earth from space.

The United States used solar energy to power satellite radios.

The United States established the shape of the earth.

The United States tape recorded satellite information for delayed delivery on ground command.

The United States shut off and re-started a satellite launcher in space.

The United States recovered an object from orbit.

The United States has launched the first weather, navigation, and communication satellites.

The United States holds the record for long-distance communication—22½ million miles.

Add to that the recent achievements in putting a great silver balloon in orbit and the recovery of a missile returned to earth from outer space.

Why do I give this in such detail?

It is because criticism of our missile program is the material the opposition employed—in its overboard approach to crusading reforms—to impugn the competence and the motives of the Eisenhower administration.

The Eisenhower administration, they said ad nauseum, is more concerned with the budget dollar than with defense.

And their answer was to demand a pouring out of more and more billions as if all that was needed to get more missiles to go farther was to open the vaults of the U.S. Treasury.

It was like arguing that all one needed to furnish the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with a dozen or so Einsteins was a larger appropriation.

The principle of leaving it to money to do the job may help—here and there—to advance one's political ambitions.

But it is not a process for establishing leadership for a world in transition and in chaos.

What the United States wants and desperately needs at the helm of its affairs is men—precisely Nixon and Lodge—who have met the men of the Kremlin and know how they think and act and fight because they faced and fought them.

They, too, as I made clear in my introduction, will seek guidance from the academic world and from experts in a variety of fields.

But their decisions will be predicated upon an amalgam of practice and theory, about knowledge and experience.

They will have behind them the philosophy of a party—the Republican Party—that thinks of its convention platform not as a fine and noble set of ideals that may be achieved in another millennium if at all.

They think of their convention platform as men of responsibility and prudence think of a contract with specifications that must be fulfilled as a matter of honor and integrity.

Almost as I speak today we have had still another and revealing index to the difference in character between the two parties.

The Congress of the United States is in a kind of postponed extraordinary session confronted with a massive order of business.

If the Democratic Party really means what it says so volubly and forcefully in its platform, here and now is the opportunity of opportunities.

The Republican President of the United States, instead of obstructing the highly touted Democratic Party aims

which might be politically expected of a lesser occupant of the White House, has come out actually as their champion.

The President says in about so many words to a Democratically controlled Congress: "Go ahead, I am all for you, and here are my words proving it." He said in essence: "Give me a good middle-of-the-road program that makes sense."

But how does the Democratic Party, at the very seat of power, react to this golden opportunity to do what it is always saying it wants to do?

Do they really want a world food bank plan that does the job?

Do they indeed favor new economic aid to Latin America that is realistic?

Are they in truth for medical assistance to the aged that is not inflationary?

Do they want a higher minimum wage or do they just want to talk about it?

Will they dish out new funds for an airborne alert?

They say they are for more generous school construction Federal aid and for higher teachers' salaries. Are they?

Of course they want to give money to the depressed areas. Well, where is it?

The answer of the Democratic Party is as compelling an insight as I know to the political differences between them and the Republican Party.

Their answer is that in the face of this magnificent moment for the Democratic Party to do what it says it believes in, the Chamber of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States is empty, I repeat, empty, of Democrats.

They have a two-thirds majority in both Houses.

On August 16, and for the second successive day, the Democratic Party was unable, in the House, to so much as muster a quorum and adjourned after only 5 minutes.

The record shows that no more than 60 of the 432 Members were on hand.

Among the absentees was the Democratic majority leadership.

Is this performance as promised?

Is this political integrity?

There is indeed a difference—a profound difference—between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party.

That difference is reflected in the leadership that came out of the Los Angeles and the Chicago conventions.

A nation seeking the leadership of responsibility, of prudence, of the experienced hand and the astute mind, a nation that wants to continue to feel optimistically and happily about the future will know how to cast its votes in November.

It will vote the way it will vote precisely because there is a difference between the two parties and because the difference is so great.

Upon the choice the American people make may very well hang the survival of mankind.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman take the position there was more thinking at the Republican National

Convention than there was at the Democratic National Convention?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Let me say this to the distinguished majority leader—

Mr. McCORMACK. I am just curious.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I have some observations, and I dwell on that point later in my talk.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman made two statements, and I was simply curious if the gentleman takes the position there was more thinking at the Republican National Convention than there was at the Democratic National Convention.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. May I say that I recognize the gentleman as a great public servant, and a great leader in his party. I want to say that I do not want to make any accusations that cannot be supported, but I have this feeling, in answer to your question, that there was more thinking that went into what we did at that convention than what went into the Democratic convention.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had an idea that whatever thinking there was at the Republican National Convention suddenly ceased when Vice President Nixon took his pilgrimage to New York to confer with Governor Rockefeller and to capitulate to Governor Rockefeller. Then the thinking at the Republican National Convention ceased.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. You know, I am very glad that the gentleman brought up that point, because this was an attitude that was not expressed by myself, but it was expressed by people at our convention, by some of our leaders. But, let me remind the gentleman that another great statesman went to McClellan. His name was Lincoln. Now, in that he demonstrated humility.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am talking about 1960. Of course, if you are going to talk about Lincoln, he would be a Democrat today if he were alive.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, that is your opinion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, now, the fact is that Lincoln was not reelected as a Republican. He was elected on the Union ticket, not on the Republican ticket.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Just let me remind you that he never denied being a Republican.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am delighted at my friend's speech. I am putting some color in it.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am glad to have the gentleman's comment, but I am not one to admit that if Lincoln were alive today, he would be a Democrat.

Mr. McCORMACK. He was a progressive.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Lincoln was a great moderate.

Mr. McCORMACK. A great what?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. A man that believed in going down the middle of the road politically and on the great issues of his time.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; he was a great progressive.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, that is your opinion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do you deny that he was?



Mr. SCHWENGEL. I do not think he was a great progressive.

Mr. McCORMACK. You do not?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I think he was a great realist. He knew what was right or wrong. I would like to make a speech sometime on this question of liberalism and on Lincoln's moderate attitude.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say "liberalism." I said "progressive."

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, you can describe him as that, and you have the right to. There were books written about the fact that he was a progressive and there were books written that he was a great moderate and there were books written about the fact that he was a great conservative. In fact, some of our great conservatives are quoting Lincoln all the time, so you do not prove anything.

Mr. McCORMACK. You said he was a great realist.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I had an idea that Lincoln had a great moral outlook on life, too.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes. Sure. He stood for rights, too.

Mr. McCORMACK. Realism is something different than what the gentleman is now saying. I am trying to get the gentleman correct in his statement as to the position of Lincoln. To say that I am a realist means that I am a man who responds to expediency, in part, and I would not want the gentleman to leave the Record to appear that he thinks he, Abraham Lincoln, was a man who responded to expediency.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Oh, you read the life of Lincoln.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am defending him.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Sure. And I defend him, too, and I defend his realism.

Mr. McCORMACK. You said he was a realist. Now, he was something plus that, was he not?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, he was a great American. He was the greatest American, and he was a Republican.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thought Nixon was the greatest American since Washington when he was nominated.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, he is the greatest living American. I admit that.

Mr. McCORMACK. You say he is the greatest living American since Washington. That means he is greater than Eisenhower, according to what you say. But, you have not answered my question. Let us come back to that. You were insinuating that there was more byplay at the Democratic National Convention than there was at the Republican National Convention. You have admitted that finally they got to Nixon and Rockefeller and then the old domination came in, did they not? You will admit that.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. You started bringing Lincoln in, and we got off on that subject.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not bring Lincoln in. You did.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. And I do not apologize for that, either.

Mr. McCORMACK. I defended Lincoln.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I will defend him, too, and I believe I have read more books on Lincoln than you have.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will you not admit, as far as the Republican convention is concerned, as far as the platform is concerned, that as far as the action of the platform committee is concerned, it became a dominated convention? Will you not agree to that?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, then, probably you are in bad shape again.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I most certainly am not. Nixon's going to Mr. Rockefeller was a demonstration of humility.

Mr. McCORMACK. Humility?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. There was realism. What I call expediency.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, you can put any interpretation on it that you want. I think it was a great move. It was the mark of a great statesman.

Mr. McCORMACK. A great statesman?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes. And I do not apologize for it.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is one man going to another, capitulating and leaving the party; is it not?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. He did not capitulate. He might have convinced Rockefeller of a lot of things.

Mr. McCORMACK. He convinced Rockefeller?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Rockefeller was the dominating thinker as between those two.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is your opinion.

Mr. McCORMACK. At least he is a progressive. He could not get two members from his side the other day and vote for his view on the medical aid bill.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Now, since you talked about that, I do not think that you should talk about it, because your record is not very good.

Mr. McCORMACK. My record?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am talking about the Democratic Party.

Mr. McCORMACK. On what?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. On almost any issue that has been before the other body and this body since we have been back.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, I will say to my dear friend, that he is a man ordinarily of intellectual honesty. But now he has put himself in a very partisan position, has taken a byroad from that general broad pathway of intellectual honesty that he ordinarily pursues. And I am complimenting him, but he does not realize it.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. It may be backhanded.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It is rather backhanded, I would say. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts does not want the Record to show that he is not partisan. He is one of the most partisan men in the House. I admire him for it; he is a great leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am a great believer in the two-party political system; but I believe that it is in the best interests of the people of the country and of their States to have the Democratic Party in control.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is the gentleman's belief; I just do not agree with him.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is how partisan I am. Of course I am partisan. I fight for my party and my party is invariably always right. And I admire the gentleman for fighting for his party. Let us not have any disagreement about that.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman. I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that my party may not always be right, but I will say to him that it is right more often than it is wrong, and it is more often right than is the Democratic Party, in my opinion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman's opinion in that respect would have very little probative weight amongst a group of objectively minded people trying an issue and making a decision, because the progressive party, the party of the people, is the Democratic Party. The gentleman's party is in the control of the Old Guard.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is something you can say, but it is another thing to prove it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have the Republican platform here. Just to be bipartisan here this afternoon, I find that the Democratic Party on pages 20 and 21 of its platform made a statement against inflation. Can the gentleman call my attention to a similar passage in the Republican platform?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am not prepared to do that. Yes, I think I could find it if I had my own copy of the platform here. I have it pretty well marked up. I have a copy of it in my office. If I had that I could tell the gentleman a lot of good things about that platform.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Let us have the Record show that the Democratic Party was concerned about that point. As a member of the platform committee at Los Angeles, I can assure the gentleman that was a very prominent point.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I hold that you cannot guarantee any balancing of the budget with that proposition, with all you seek to do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will take time in the next hour. I hope the gentleman will stay around to join the debate.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I will stay and listen.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Before the gentleman proceeds will he yield further?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I do not have too much time left.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I was wondering which Roosevelt used the phrase "Malfactors of great wealth."

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, that is a very small point, and I know what the gentleman is talking about. And, I am glad to say that it was Theodore Roosevelt.

#### THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF DAVID CHAMBERS MEARNS

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, from reading biographies, studying the lives of great men, and from association with important people of our own time, we come to know that now and then, over the centuries, the human race gives us men and women of transcendent genius who, in serving their own time, display a quality of timeliness that gives to them, to their deeds, to people they associate with and to their words, productive meaning for generations to come.

Today, I would like at this time to pay tribute to a man whom I consider one of those great men and who has earned this title by being a very distinguished public servant, one whose career of more than 40 years in the Library of Congress has lent much luster to the Government and to the service it renders to the people. In placing before you the record of David Chambers Mearns, Chief of the Manuscript Division of the Library, I would like to point with pride not only to the great services that the Library as a whole performs to this Congress, to the Government, and to the people of the United States, but also to the individual services that such a person as Mr. Mearns, through the everyday conduct of his duties, is constantly rendering—and all too often with complete modesty and utter anonymity. Based on my experience, I have noted that the people who use the services of the Government tend to take our Government personnel too much for granted. Too often we accept as a matter of course the services we require to carry on the necessary business of Government and all too often we who have the privilege to serve as representatives of the people forget that our own accomplishments are only made possible by the hard labor of many others. There is a tendency, moreover, to note and stress the shortcomings of public service rather than the virtues, to single out defects at the expense of really excellent qualities. By and large, I think, our Government personnel have an exceptional record of devotion to duty, integrity, and a keen sense of the values for things that are in the public interest.

Because David Mearns embodies these qualities in high degree I am glad to have this opportunity to point out how his lifetime contribution has greatly benefited not only the thousands of people the Library every day serves, but the entire world of scholarship.

Let me first acknowledge my own personal indebtedness to Mr. Mearns, who is one of our country's foremost experts on the life and times of Abraham Lincoln. It was to him that I went—before going to anyone else—when it struck me as appropriate that the Congress of the United States should observe and prop-

erly commemorate last year the sesquicentennial of Lincoln's birth. It was he who, at my suggestion, wrote House Joint Resolution 648, calling for a joint session of the two Houses of Congress, which many people believe became one of the central events, if not the central event, of the Lincoln sesquicentennial commemoration. The joint committee of the House and Senate that named me chairman of the joint committee on arrangements and, at my suggestion, named Mr. Mearns its secretary. He was thus an active participant in all the measures that, using such superlative and diverse talents as those of Carl Sandburg and Fredric March, contributed so largely to the national success of the ceremonies. His expert judgment and wise counsel were of enormous advantage in this recreation of a great American tradition, enacted with the Congress as the backdrop and the Senators, Representatives, Government officials, and diplomatic corps as the persons of the drama. Looking back on it, it seems to me that as fortunate as any decision I made for the anniversary was the one to enlist the help of David Mearns for me and for the committee.

As president of the Lincoln Group in the District of Columbia that sponsored the Lincoln Banquet on the eve of the 150th anniversary of Lincoln's birth, I can testify to the fact that his counsel, advice, patient and dedicated help and direction in making the Lincoln Banquet program the success that it was, was invaluable. This outstanding program featured President Dwight D. Eisenhower; Bishop S. M. Emrich, of the Episcopal diocese of Michigan; and Fredric March, and was honored by the presence of Vice President Richard Nixon and hundreds of citizens, students, distinguished Americans and members of the diplomatic corps.

Mr. Mearns' progress to his present position of eminence was steady, and was foreordained by the sterling qualities he brought to the performance of his duties. His entire life has been spent in the service of the Library of Congress, and he has been a career man in the best sense of that term. Born in the District of Columbia on the last day of 1899, he was educated here at St. Albans School and at George Washington University, then at the University of Virginia. At the age of 18 he joined the Library's staff—at the princely starting salary of \$360 a year—expecting, as he now recalls, merely “to remain through the Christmas holidays.” Such was not to be, and today, after more than 40 years with that institution, he is fond of reminiscing on what he genially terms his “inexplicable survival and the Library's extraordinary endurance.” After 2 years as a reference assistant in the Order Division, he transferred to the reading rooms, where he served successively as a stack inspector, special assistant, and chief assistant. In 1939 this phase of his career culminated with his appointment as superintendent of the reading rooms. Two years later he became Chief Reference Librarian, and from 1943 to 1949 he served as director of the reference

department. In 1949 he became Assistant Librarian, and in 1951 he assumed his present post as Chief of the Manuscript Division, in addition to which he carries on the duties of Assistant Librarian for the American Collections and of incumbent of the Library's Chair of American History.

As Chief of the Manuscript Division, Mr. Mearns has had and has challenging responsibilities. He is the custodian of more than 17 million papers that are of inestimable value to students of the American past. This priceless storehouse of original sources includes the originals of Thomas Jefferson's rough draft of the Declaration of Independence; George Washington's commission as commander in chief of the Continental Army; James Madison's notes on the proceedings of the Convention that framed the Constitution of the United States; the first and second drafts of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; the personal papers of 23 Presidents of the United States; many papers of their outstanding contemporaries, from Benjamin Franklin and Alexander Hamilton to Charles Evans Hughes and Cordell Hull; and the papers of distinguished scientists, jurists, military and naval figures, explorers, authors, architects, artists, editors, diplomats, clergymen, teachers, actors, doctors, industrialists, financiers, and philanthropists—in sum, the papers of those men and women who, in the long history of our Nation, have exerted a profound and lasting influence on the lives and destinies of their countrymen. In addition, the Manuscript Division administered by Mr. Mearns houses millions of transcripts and reproductions of material important for the study of American history that have been gathered over the course of many years from the archives of Great Britain, France, Spain, Mexico, and Canada. This invaluable collection is one of our national treasures, and is a basic key for understanding and interpreting our past and present. To it, every year, thousands of scholars come from all over the country to carry on fundamental research for books and studies that contribute to the truth of history.

During Mr. Mearns' tenure as chief of the division, some 5 million papers have been added to the collections in his care, and the Library's resources for service to the American people have increased correspondingly. But, Mr. Mearns is not just a custodian and a gatherer of manuscripts; he is a distinguished historian in his own right, amply qualified and experienced to develop and interpret the precious documents, writings, memorabilia, and instruments of freedom that are in his charge. By some people, in fact, he has been called a historian's historian. With this observation I agree wholeheartedly.

A writer of distinguished style, sparkling wit, and great charm, with a deep respect for fact and a passionate devotion to truth, he is the author of works that have made distinct contributions to the understanding of our past and present. I shall not attempt to enumerate them all, for the list is a long one, but a glance at some of the subjects will



suffice to indicate their range and variety. They include a thoroughgoing study, in 1933, of Elias Boudinot Caldwell, an important figure in the early history of the Supreme Court; a description of the travels of the Constitution of the United States, in 1937; a study of the Lincoln Cathedral copy of that great document of English liberties, the Magna Carta, in 1939; a definitive history of the Library of Congress, published under the title "The Story Up to Now," in 1947; a history of the Declaration of Independence as a document, in 1950; and a beautifully executed memorial tribute, in 1955, to Herbert Putnam, Librarian of Congress from 1899 to 1939, under whom Mr. Mearns served his apprenticeship. One of the most interesting aspects of his writings is that he has produced very few that fall into the category of technical library literature. Mr. Mearns is fundamentally a historian, and he has dedicated most of his literary effort to producing works that will have lasting value to scholar and layman alike.

To this group belong Mr. Mearns' numerous writings on Abraham Lincoln, upon which I should like to dwell a bit, both because of my personal interest in our greatest American statesman and because they have brought their author well-earned praises from the scholarly world. In addition to studies on such subjects as books that Lincoln read, on a letter of sympathy written by Queen Victoria to Mary Todd Lincoln after the President's assassination, and on myths that have grown up about Lincoln, Mr. Mearns is the author of a two-volume work entitled "The Lincoln Papers," published in 1948. For this publication he sifted through the entire body of Lincoln manuscripts that had been bequeathed to the Library of Congress by the will of Robert Todd Lincoln, Abraham Lincoln's elder son, and that were opened to public view for the very first time at midnight on July 26, 1947. These papers had been waiting for informed scrutiny for many years, during which, following Robert Todd Lincoln's wishes, they had been kept secret in order to spare the feelings of those who had been participants in the events of his father's administration and who might—in his view—have been embarrassed by disclosures in them. In editing the material which he selected from some 18,560 documents in the Lincoln papers, Mr. Mearns presented pertinent data that had never before been made known, and demonstrated—to my satisfaction, at least—that Robert Todd Lincoln had not destroyed any great masses of his father's papers. Thus he laid to rest a popular myth for which there had been some apparent evidence. Actually much better evidence—which he brought forth—proves it to be extremely unlikely. The Lincoln papers may, by his informed demonstration, be said to be intact, with some minor exceptions, and his two-volume selection from them ranks as a very real and distinctive contribution to Lincoln literature.

That this is not merely my own opinion, but is shared by others, may be seen from comments that have been made about the volumes by those best

qualified to criticize them. In his introduction to "The Lincoln Papers," for example, Carl Sandburg wrote that, I quote:

We have herein the most complete study thus far made of the actions of Robert T. Lincoln and his personality, with relation to the collection of papers.

Another distinguished historian, the late Charles A. Beard, wrote that, I quote:

Besides telling an exciting story of the Lincoln documents \* \* \* Mr. Mearns presents an impressive collection of the papers—mainly letters and memoranda to Lincoln—which will help immeasurably in reconstructing the world in which he lived and worked.

Archibald MacLeish, poet and former Librarian of Congress, made this observation:

A few of us who have read the deft, urbane, and salty prose of David Mearns have long realized that he is one of the pleasantest authors of our time to read. Readers of "The Lincoln Papers" have that discovery before them as well as the infinite treasures of the book itself.

And Carl Carmer, another writer of rank, commented in the following words:

These letters and memoranda are more revealing \* \* \* than any historian's writings could possibly be. They build up by indirection the noble and tragic (in the Greek sense) figure of the President until he looms \* \* \* like a giant seated on a mountain above the clouds.

Above all I should like to read to you a paragraph—but only a paragraph—of an appreciation by Mr. Mearns himself of Abraham Lincoln, which will at the same time demonstrate his felicitous style and the complete understanding he is able to convey of the noble figure who is his ever-engrossing theme:

Abraham Lincoln stands alone in history largely because in life he stood among the people. Only through them, the inhabitants of a wide, broken, angry land, is it possible to find him. Their responses to him and his to them, their anguish and his sympathies, their aspirations and his endeavors, their reaching out and his upholding of them are the strong roots from which his towering spirit grows.

There are many other significant and meaningful accomplishments of Mr. Mearns' on which I might dwell in some detail, but it may be best, on this occasion, merely to make only a brief reference to them. His cumulative endeavors over the course of his more than 40 years with the Library of Congress have engaged him in such tasks as achieving the permanent sealing and preservation in helium of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, assembling in order in the White House the library of Calvin Coolidge, and arranging for cataloging and transfer to the Library of Congress of the superb collection of books gathered by the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. Professionally, too, his accomplishments have been impressive. Among the offices he has held are the presidency of the District of Columbia Library Association and the vice-presidency and presidency of the Manuscript Society, and in addition to honorary membership in the

Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission and service on its advisory committee, he has been a member of the National Historical Publications Commission and of the Civil War Centennial Commission. In recognition of his contributions to scholarship, he was given the honorary degree of doctor of letters by Lincoln University on May 29, last.

Finally, a word might be said about the impress Mr. Mearns has made on his colleagues, both through the aid he has given them in line of duty as Chief of the Manuscript Division and incumbent of the Chair of American History at the Library, and through the scholarly writings he has produced in such abundance. I have garnered a few items from the Library's archives to support this record. A woman journalist on a great newspaper found it possible, she reported, to write a book on top of her full-time job because of the assistance Mr. Mearns rendered her. The late Benjamin P. Thomas, author of a definitive one-volume life of Lincoln, addressed his thanks to Mr. Mearns for what he had done "for the Lincoln story and for me." Dr. Julian P. Boyd, in the first volume of his authoritative edition of "The Writings of Thomas Jefferson," acknowledged his debt to Mr. Mearns "for all he has done to make this work possible." The English scholar F. J. Hudleston, in his treatise entitled "Gentleman Johnny Burgoyne," declared that without Mr. Mearns' help "this book would have been but a bald and unconvincing narrative." The late J. G. Randall, a very distinguished biographer of Lincoln, paid tribute to Mr. Mearns' writings in his book "Lincoln the President: Midstream" for "full information and unusual literary charm." And finally Paul M. Angle, also a noted Lincolnian, referred to one of Mr. Mearns' writings in these terms:

When one has at hand a work so comprehensive, so well-informed, so gracefully written, an independent investigation is simply a waste of time.

It is, of course, known that Mr. Mearns' wise counsel often proved invaluable in the determination of policies at the Library of Congress. All who worked with him and under him have relished his genial wisdom. It is known, too, that the men and women at the Library of Congress cherish his friendship and have nothing but the highest regard for his solid contributions to the magnificent library which belongs both to the Congress and to the Nation.

I should like to give one more quotation, an excerpt that seems to me to epitomize the spirit one likes to think of as embodied in the Library of Congress. The passage was written by James Truslow Adams in his "The Epic of America," published almost 30 years ago:

The Library of Congress \* \* \* has come straight from the heart of democracy \* \* \* and I here use it as a symbol of what democracy can accomplish on its own behalf \* \* \*. As one looks down on the general reading room, which alone contains 10,000 volumes which may be read without even the asking, one sees the seats filled with silent readers, old and young, rich and poor, black and white, the executive and the laborer, the general and the private, the noted scholar and the

schoolboy, all reading at their own library provided by their own democracy. It has always seemed to me to be a perfect working out in a concrete example of the American dream—the means provided by the accumulated resources of the people themselves, a public intelligent enough to use them, and men of high distinction, themselves a part of the great democracy, devoting themselves to the good of the whole.

I salute David Chambers Mearns as one of these "men of high distinction, themselves a part of the great democracy, devoting themselves to the good of the whole." He is a living example and proves the truth of a theme recognized in most great, unselfish, public servants. It is, that whenever you do something for someone else that will stimulate his knowledge, enrich his experiences, and improve his position in life, without any thought of reward or recognition, you make life easier, more interesting and rewarding for the recipient of those favors and through him you are doing a service to humanity that will add to the heritage of your community, State and Nation and your own reward to giver of these virtues derives from the great satisfaction that you have done what is right.

Mr. Speaker, I treasure this man's friendship, I covet his attitude and ability and say, Thank God for great souls and great Americans like David Chambers Mearns.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION CONTINUES TO MISMANAGE THE NATIONAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it would be tempting to argue the question just presented by my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGLER], whether or not the late William McKinley really was in fact a red-hot liberal, but I should prefer to address myself to some of the economic problems of the 1960's, rather than to those of the last century. One of the most important economic issues before this Congress is the administration's money policies, or lack of them.

Those who disagree with the administration's money policies, like myself, contend that they are designed mainly to produce higher and higher interest rates. The effects of higher and higher interest rates are undoubtedly pleasing to lenders in general, and to commercial banks in particular.

But a high interest rate schedule is a poor way to achieve the goals of maximum employment, production and purchasing power set forth by the Employment Act of 1946, and a poor way of managing the \$290 billion national debt.

Very largely because of the tight money policies of the administration, our growth rate in recent years has averaged scarcely one-half that of the countries of Western Europe, and scarcely one-third that of the Soviet Union. A disquieting plateau of unemployment, of around 5 percent, contin-

ues. And every month the cost of living reaches a new alltime high.

#### MISSING: A COORDINATED MONEY POLICY

One of the reasons the administration's money policy seems so perverse and wrong-headed is because the administration refuses to concede that it has any duty to come forward with a money policy at all. Consistently, the President's economic reports to the Congress have talked about taxes and spending, what State and local government should do, what labor and management should do, but nothing about what should be done in the field of monetary policy. As a result, the administration, the Treasury, the Federal Reserve System, and other agencies concerned with monetary policy have each gone their own way—and oftentimes directly in the wrong direction.

H.R. 6263, sponsored by Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and myself, endeavors to correct this by requiring the President to include in his economic reports recommendations concerning monetary policy, in the same manner as any other policy. The bill was favorably reported by the House Government Operations Committee 14 months ago, on June 6, 1959. The House Committee on Rules, unfortunately, has refused to let Members consider the bill by failing, for 14 long months, to give it a rule.

Let me give several recent examples of the administration's irresponsible money policy.

#### LENGTHENING THE DEBT

First, let us look at the administration's policy with respect to the issuance of U.S. bonds—those having a maturity of 5 years or more. Everyone would agree that, other things being equal, it is desirable to have the largest possible portion of the Federal debt in long-term issues. The main reason for this is that the less frequently issues come due, the less frequently is the Treasury put to the embarrassment of refinancing the debt at a time when interest rates are high.

Yet all during the early years of the administration, when interest rates still retained the reasonable level which they had inherited from the previous Democratic administration, the Eisenhower administration failed to take advantage of these golden opportunities to convert the national debt to a longer term. In fact, just the opposite process ensued. The average maturity of this debt has dwindled from 5.07 years in 1953 to 4.25 years today.

Meanwhile—while foregoing the golden opportunity to issue long-term securities at reasonable interest rates—the administration embarked upon its great crusade to get interest rates as high as possible.

#### THE 4 1/4 PERCENT INTEREST CEILING

Almost the first fiscal action of this administration when it took office in 1953 was to break through the pattern of interest rates being paid on Government securities. In April 1953, the famous "Humphrey 3 1/4's" were issued, starting the trend of interest rates upward. With

the exception of a few months in 1954, in early 1958, and today, long-term rates have been marching steadily upward ever since.

In June 1959, the President, in a special request for legislation, asked the Congress to remove the traditional statutory ceiling on rates payable on Treasury bond issues. The ceiling applied to new issues over 5 years in maturity and had been in effect for more than 40 years—since World War I. The Committee on Ways and Means listened carefully and at length to the arguments of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury for doing away with this longstanding 4 1/4-percent ceiling. But it found the arguments unconvincing.

Not to be discouraged by this display of judgment on the part of the Congress, the President continued to insist upon his demand for a free hand, unrestrained by the limits imposed by Congress. In the budget document presented in January 1960, he reiterated that it was imperative that the Congress lift the legal ceiling, saying that otherwise interest payments could rise even more sharply. The recommendation, repeated at every opportunity, was stressed again in the annual economic message a few days later.

Again the committees of Congress, including the Joint Economic Committee, reviewed the merits of the administration's plea for a free hand and came out confirmed in the conclusion that there was no persuasive need for the elimination of the 4 1/4-percent statutory ceiling, and that its removal would simply open the way for the rates to continue to rise as they had been doing. With no limit in sight, 5 percent, 6 percent, or more, seemed possible and probable, since there was obviously no will on the part of the administration to slow or stop the upward trend in rates which was not only adding to the costs of government but to the costs of doing business and buying houses and appliances.

#### NOW INTEREST RATES HAVE DECLINED

In the year from June 1959 to June 1960, while the administration was moving heaven and earth to get the 4 1/4-percent ceiling removed, interest rates were high. Had Congress removed the ceiling, the American taxpayer would have been saddled with billions of dollars of 5 or 6 percent bonds, with the interest burden payable over the next 20 or 30 years. The general interest rate structure would have been given another upward push.

In recent months, however, interest rates have declined—partly through Federal Reserve action, partly through a decline in the demand for loans generally. Today U.S. bonds with 20 years still to run are selling at 3.8 percent, well below the 4 1/4-percent ceiling. The average yield for 10-year bonds has fallen from 4.29 percent last February—when the President was ready to let them go skyward—to 3.76 percent early in August 1960.

Up to 2 or 3 months ago, when yields on bonds were in excess of the 4 1/4 percent ceiling, the administration was in a veritable frenzy to get the ceiling re-



pealed, so that it could market vast amounts of bonds at sky-high interest rates. Now that interest rates are down to more reasonable levels—around 3½ percent—you would think that the administration would be marketing bonds like mad. After all, 3½ percent is one-half a percentage point below the 4½ percent ceiling, which thus becomes a dead letter.

#### BUT THE ADMINISTRATION FAILS TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE DECLINE

But suddenly, as interest rates have become more reasonable, the administration's zeal to issue bonds has become halfhearted. Almost \$150 billion of marketable debt comes due within 5 years. What has the administration done to lengthen the debt? \$370 million of 4½-percent bonds were issued in April. A June offering of 3½-percent 7-year-11-month bonds totaled \$320 million. Early in August 1960, 3½-percent bonds due May 15, 1968, were sold in the amount of \$1 billion, although subscriptions in five times this amount were received. Together, these three issues aggregate less than \$1.8 billion, compared with the almost \$150 billion of marketable debt due within 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Treasury recovers from its state of shock at finding it can market bonds at well below the 4½ percent ceiling, and proceeds to do so promptly, and in an amount many times its puny attempts of recent months.

Billions of dollars worth of securities under 1 year come due all the time. The Treasury should take steps to get some of these short-term bills into long-term bonds while the getting is good.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we have it on the Treasury's own authority that such a sensible lengthening program is precisely what it is not going to do. The August 19, 1960, Wall Street Journal quotes Under Secretary of the Treasury Julian Baird as looking with disfavor on selling "heavy amounts of any long-term bonds in an outright cash sale."

When the Treasury offers a long-term bond for cash—

Mr. Baird is quoted as saying—

it captures funds that would otherwise be available for other types of long-term securities.

#### WHY NOT TRY TO SELL SOME BONDS?

What kind of midsummer madness is this? Why should not the Treasury compete for funds in the marketplace? Particularly, who should not it compete at a time when loanable funds are more plentiful, as indicated by lower interest rates, rather than at a time when loanable funds are less plentiful, as indicated by higher interest rates? When the long-term interest rate goes sky-high again, it will be time to stop trying to sell bonds. For years the Treasury has been having hysterics about the great amount of short-term securities outstanding—"the equivalent of cash"—and hence dangerous. But now that the opportunity to convert these short-term securities into long-term bonds presents itself, we are apparently to pass the opportunity by.

Instead, the Treasury apparently intends to exchange all or part of the presently outstanding \$28 billion 2½-percent World War II bonds maturing in 1972—12 years from now—for bonds of 20 years or longer, and carrying a coupon of 3½ percent or more.

This is a sad substitute for a serious effort to lengthen the debt. We should be delighted that we have outstanding \$28 billion of bonds paying only 2½ percent, and not due for 12 years. We should cherish them, not liquidate them as if the very sight of a low-interest coupon offended us.

If the Treasury follows through on its threat, it will saddle the taxpayers with up to \$280 million a year higher interest charges on this issue alone for the next 10 or 12 years.

Any private debtor who had a 2½-percent mortgage on his home—or 4½-percent mortgage for that matter—who hunted up his creditor and offered him 6 percent for the remaining 12 years of his mortgage would be deemed to be suffering from the heat. When the Treasury does it, it is called statesmanship.

#### THE SAVINGS-TYPE INVESTOR SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED

So let us hope that the Treasury will forget about its ill-conceived advance refund and get down to business on converting short terms into long terms. In the process, the Treasury might follow a little of the anti-inflation advice which it has so freely given out in the past. The Treasury has often pointed out—quite rightly in my opinion—that the sale of U.S. bonds to the commercial banks is potentially inflationary, and that to the largest possible extent bonds should be lodged with so-called savings-type investors, such as individuals and nonbanking corporations. But look what happened with the \$1 billion offering of 8-year 3½ bonds of August 1960. Total subscriptions amounted to \$5.2 billion. Savings-type investors had their subscriptions cut down to a mere 25 percent of the amount they had indicated they were willing to take in order to accommodate two other types of subscribers—commercial banks and all others. The commercial banks were allotted 20 percent of their subscription, all others 15 percent of their subscription.

Mr. Speaker, we need to issue as many bonds as we can—replacing short-term securities—and we need to lodge them as much as possible in noninflationary hands. The Treasury needs to do some explaining why it allotted to savings-type investors only 25 percent of the bonds for which they had subscribed, and why it cut down their allotment in order to make room for potentially inflationary purchases by commercial banks.

#### THE TREASURY'S ALLOTMENT PROCEDURE

Here is what the August 8, 1960, newsletter of Aubrey G. Lanston & Co., Inc., one of the 27 specialists in U.S. Government securities, has to say about the

Treasury's allotment procedure, with respect to bonds and certificates:

From the point of view of the market, from the points of view of what may be described as continuing holders of short-term securities (notably nonfinancial corporations and businesses) and bona fide investors in Treasury bonds the procedures used in this recent financing leave much to be desired and warrant serious review. When Treasury offers encourage (and in some cases more or less demand) that subscriptions be padded, all market participants are obliged to engage in wild guesses as to how low the percentage allotment may or may not be swung by such padding. In addition, the prospect that many bona fide buyers may not get what they want on allotment from the Treasury inspires speculation of the less desirable types. The end results frequently are to frustrate bona fide investors, to generate gyrations on a day-to-day basis in the market and, on occasion, to leave undesirable amounts of undigestible securities in the hands of temporary holders. These temporary holders may include all varieties of speculators—those whose operations frequently are helpful to the market and those whose dealings may at times be upsetting. Perhaps we should emphasize that temporary holders of this type—speculators if you please—include many financial institutions; such holdings are not confined to and may not even consist largely of marginal holdings of individuals, security firms, and so forth. In one or another measure the procedures used in this financing encouraged such undesirable developments. \* \* \*

This is the kind of situation that invites heavy subscription padding, with which commercial banks and some others have had long experience. Commercial banks have learned to use their large subscribing power to pad their subscriptions on the basis of an expected low percentage allotment so that they will come closer to getting what they want or will get some securities that they can sell at a profit after allotment or shortly after taking delivery. On the other hand, nonfinancial corporations, who have proved to be large continuing investors in short-term securities, are not geared to pad their subscriptions and probably would be unwise to adopt padding as a practice except in a degree that may be said to be rather modest when compared with that engaged in by commercial banks and some others.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Treasury does not seem very anxious to sell bonds at reasonable interest rates, which would give the taxpayer a break for a change. And, in its timid and meager issue so far, it has shown a lamentable tendency to freeze out the savings-type investor in favor of the inflationary commercial bank investor.

#### "BILLS ONLY" STILL THE POLICY

And, on top of all this, the administration, through the Federal Reserve, is showing the same lamentable unconcern as before with managing the national debt economically and reducing the back-breaking annual interest charge on the national debt—now approaching \$9 billion per year—as much as possible consistent with prudent anti-inflationary policy.

The Joint Economic Committee last February urged the Federal Reserve to junk its doctrinaire "bills only" policy. When the Federal Reserve increases the money supply, said the Joint Economic Committee, let it do so by a judicious

purchase of Federal securities of all maturities, including bonds, and not just bills. Nevertheless, the Federal Reserve, as reported by the August, 1960, Morgan Guarantee Bank Survey, continues to restrict itself to the purchase of bills. As a result, bond purchases are somewhat less, and bond yields somewhat higher, than would be the case were the Federal Reserve to be included on the purchasing side of the U.S. bond market. In all likelihood, yields lower than the present 3½ percent on bonds would be possible were the Federal Reserve to cast off the iron maiden of the "bills only" policy in which it has encased itself.

#### THE TAXPAYER FORGOTTEN

Another example of the Fed's cavalier attitude toward the taxpayer was given in August, when the Fed issued an order reducing the reserve requirements of member banks, thus expanding their loaning power. As has been many times pointed out, when an expansion of the money supply is indicated, the taxpayers are benefited where the Federal Reserve expands the money supply by purchasing U.S. securities, but not where it does so by lowering bank reserve requirements. This is so because the interest the Federal Reserve receives on U.S. securities inures to the benefit of the Treasury. It is clear from the legislative history of the 1959 Vault Cash Act that Congress wanted overall additions to the money supply created by purchase of U.S. securities, not by lowering bank reserve requirements. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 19, 1960, page 810.

The Federal Reserve, in doing this, has succeeded in kicking Congress in the teeth and the taxpayer in the pants all in one motion—a neat trick, even for the Federal Reserve.

#### LOWER STOCK MARGINS

Another recent Federal Reserve action appears to have been aimed more at keeping the stock market high than at helping the Government bond market. Earlier this month the Fed lowered margin requirements on the purchase of stock from 90 to 70 percent. This was admittedly designed to bring more loanable funds into the stock market and raise stock prices. Yet every dollar diverted into the stock market is a dollar diverted from other purposes, including the purchase of U.S. securities. The more demand for U.S. securities, the lower yields will be, and the lighter will be the burden of the national debt. It would be a wonderful thing if the Federal Reserve would show the same solicitude for the market in U.S. securities that it does for the stock market.

It may be asking for miracles, Mr. Speaker, but would it be possible for the administration to give a little thought to the views of Congress on money policy in the months to come? Cannot the Treasury make an all-out effort to lengthen the national debt by making cash bond offerings in decent volume? Cannot savings-type investors be given a break and allowed a more reasonable part of their subscription before they are elbowed aside in favor of the inflationary offers of the commercial banks?

Will not the Federal Reserve do something about achieving lower interest rates on U.S. bonds by occasionally buying a bond instead of a bill? Would it not give the taxpayer a break by creating new reserves—whenever they need to be created—by purchasing U.S. securities rather than by lowering bank reserve requirements? And would the Fed not wait until a more rational relationship between bond and stock yields is restored before it increases stock market speculation by lowering margin requirements?

It would be a wonderful thing if President Eisenhower could give us the answers to these questions.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin for having raised this point, as well as for his own unflagging effort in this important matter.

This is one of the central economic issues of our time, the matter of interest rates and the availability of credit. This year the Congress, like a horse dragged unwilling to water, refused to drink the draught prescribed by the administration of removing the long standing ceiling on long-term Government obligations. This was the first break in the ever-increasing upward spiral of interest rates.

Much has been said, and not all of it fully understood, about this deliberately contrived policy of tight money. Let us measure exactly what it is, how it works, and what effect it has upon the economy and upon the average American. There are three things that need to be said about this hard money policy.

#### 1. DELIBERATELY PLANNED

In the first place, it did not just happen. It was deliberately planned, artificially manipulated. It has become a conscious policy of the government, sponsored and maintained by the administration. Some administration apologists, apparently embarrassed by the effects of the policy, have tried to disavow the blame by saying it was all just a matter of the interest rate, like water, seeking its own level. This is not exactly true.

Nine days after the present administration took office in January of 1953, the new Secretary of the Treasury began offering Government securities which had been yielding only 1½ percent for a new rate of 2¼ to 2½ percent. In that one stroke of the pen, this increased rate on that limited amount of securities automatically added more than \$30 million to the taxpayers' bill for interest on the public debt.

This began a deliberate upward spiral, consisting of a series of many similar increases, and thus encouraging increases in all interest rates. In quick succession, rates were increased on private bank loans, farm price support programs, FHA loans to home buyers, GI housing loans, installment credit, municipal bonds and nearly everything involving an interest charge.

Since public debt consists of about one-third of all debts, it is easy to see how this calculated public policy of deliberately sponsoring higher interest rates has affected all interest charges. It has been a game of economic leapfrog.

These moves of our various Government agencies involving various loan programs, each trying to match and outdo the other in higher interest charges, has been like a husband and wife, lost from each other in a crowd at a country auction, bidding against each other for the same commodity. They have been bidding up the price of the commodity, which in this case is money. Moreover, they have done it knowingly and deliberately.

#### 2. WHO GETS HURT

The second thing that needs pointing out is that everybody—or practically everybody—gets hurt when interest rates go up. The only people who benefit are those who loan and do not borrow.

Anyone who is a debtor of any type automatically gets hurt. Anyone who has bought a home since 1952 gets hurt by the hard money policy. Anyone who has bought a car and paid for it other than totally by cash has been hurt. Anyone who has borrowed money for a business, anyone who has borrowed money for a farm, anyone who has borrowed money to repair or improve his home has been hurt.

Anyone who has bought any kind of furniture or appliance or anything else on time payments, has been hurt. Since this includes most Americans, almost all have suffered to a greater or lesser degree.

Moreover, anyone who pays taxes has suffered. Taxpayers are, in fact, the biggest group of losers. In 1952, before the tight money policy, it was costing U.S. taxpayers \$5.8 billion annually to pay interest on the national debt. It is estimated that next year it will cost approximately \$9 billion in carrying charges an increase of more than \$3 billion annually in the interest rate alone on the national debt. This is more than the entire cost of the Federal Government in any New Deal year before World War II.

Interest rates on FHA financed homes have risen several times. In 1952, a \$10,000 FHA loan at 4 percent for 25 years would cost a total of \$15,840 to repay. Today the same loan for the same house, now costing at least 5½ percent, will require the homeowner to shell out a total of more than \$18,000 before his house is paid for. In other words, he will be paying about \$2,200 more over the long pull in excess interest for which he gets nothing in return.

If you trade in the old car for a new one and owe a \$2,000 balance on the purchase price to be paid over 24 months, it will cost you almost 10 percent more in nothing but interest.

Loans available from the Farmers Home Administration have been boosted from 4 to 5 percent, or an increase of one-fourth. Interest payments on an acre of real estate, according to the Department of Agriculture Index, have risen from 104 in January of 1953 to 189 at the present, a boost of four-fifths.



If your school district votes \$2 million worth of bonds to build a new school, it will cost the taxpayers of that district approximately \$500,000 more over the amortization period before the school is paid for.

So it ought to be clear on its face everybody gets hurt. The hard-money policy in all of these insidious ways has siphoned away at least \$600 and probably more from the spendable income of the average family. This is money which could have been spent educating your children or paying for clothes or installing appliances in your home.

### 3. EFFECT ON THE ECONOMY

The total effect has been to soak up a total of some \$12 billions in excess interest from the economy.

By siphoning off this spending power from America's families, the tight money policy has had a profound effect upon the Nation's economy. Spending power among America's families is the oil which lubricates the machinery of American business. The more money our families have to spend, the more they can purchase from the retailer and the more he can order from the wholesaler and the more things that can be profitably produced by our manufacturing enterprises which employ millions of Americans.

Thus, both by soaking up spending power from the markets and by making it harder for small business to finance growth, this deliberately contrived policy has stifled and retarded the entire economy.

Its announced purpose was to discourage borrowing and to fight inflation. As can be clearly seen, however, it most emphatically has not discouraged borrowing or buying on time. People are continuing to buy things on time. The only difference is that it costs more in the long run to pay for those things they are buying. Installment indebtedness is at an alltime high. As an anti-inflationary device it has been an abysmal failure. It has been like throwing gasoline on the fire. By adding this extra hidden layer of cost to everything we buy, it has increased the cost of living and of doing business.

The hard-money program has created an anachronism in our economy. For the first time we have had high prices on one hand and increased unemployment and recession on the other. The value of the dollar has been made to go up and up for those who lend it, while it has come down and down for those who spend it.

And this has been the real tragedy of the hard-money era. It has kept our economic plant from growing at a pace sufficient to keep up with the advances of technology and the burgeoning growth of our population.

Just stop and think for a minute upon how rapidly our population is expanding. Every day when we sit down to dinner, there are 7,200 more of us in America needing to be served. Every month there is the population equivalent of a new Austin or a new Waco in our midst. Every 2 months there is a new Fort Worth. Every 6 months there is a new Harris County.

Yet our economy as a whole has not recently been keeping pace. From 1933 to 1953, the gross national product advanced at an average annual rate of 5.4 percent. Since 1953 and the advent of this stultifying monetary policy, the economic growth rate has skidded to only 2.4 percent annually.

This is a tragedy. During the past year, due largely to the effects of this restrictive policy, the United States has shown the lowest economic growth rate of any major industrial nation in the world.

If we are to sustain the rate of progress to which our economy had become accustomed before this recent stiffing, if we are to prove to a world choosing sides between our way and Russia's that the United States is not an old Nation slowing down in the autumn of its existence but still a young and virile and inspiring example of productive progress, then we must cultivate anew an economic climate conducive to growth and optimism and new enterprise.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his very valuable contribution. I commend him on his role in this Congress, on the one hand fighting inflation, moving toward a sense of fiscal responsibility, moving toward balanced budgets in times of prosperity, indeed, budgets yielding a surplus so that payment on the national debt can be inaugurated, and at the same time vigorously exposing the fallacy of the administration's high interest rate policy and showing that, far from fighting inflation, it causes inflation.

I think on the roll of those who deserve credit for defeating the administration's attempt to get rid of the 4½-percent interest ceiling on long-term bonds should be placed the name of the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JIM WRIGHT. His contribution deserves the gratitude of every homeowner, every purchaser on installment credit, every school district, every local government that has to borrow money to meet its long-term needs. I think the gentleman has made a fine contribution to the health of our economy, and he has done it, I must say, with precious little help from the administration.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate our colleague for taking this time today. In my opinion, this is one of the most important public issues in America today.

Mr. Speaker, those who defend this administration's tight-money, high-interest policy usually make the wild charge that the only alternative to tight money is runaway inflation. Aside from the fact that, as I have indicated earlier, the high-interest policies of recent years have themselves been an important cause of inflation, this implication that anyone who is opposed to tight money is unsound and irresponsible represents a blatant attempt to oversimplify the issue and ignores the fact that a responsible monetary policy would not rest on either extreme.

A sound monetary policy would be one which aims at healthy economic growth and stable prices. The tight-money policy of this administration has been an appalling failure on both counts. It has resulted in a lagging economic growth accompanied by continued rises in the cost of living. From a historic rate of 3.5 percent a year, our economic growth in the past 7 years has fallen to an average of only 2.4 percent a year. At the same time, the cost of living has risen by more than 10 percent. In other words, while failing utterly, as any housewife can tell you, to stop inflation as it was supposed to do, this policy of restricting our money supply and providing the moneylenders with a bonanza of ever higher interest rates has retarded our economy's expansion and will leave the next administration a heritage of unemployed human and natural resources coupled with unmet needs.

For the defenders of tight money to argue that this sorry record of slowed-down growth and increased cost is the only alternative to what they call "easy money" is eloquent testimony to the bankruptcy of ideas and policies which it offers to our people. We have proved in the past that the policy goals of the Employment Act of 1946 can be met and met adequately with a responsible monetary policy which has the general welfare of the people and the broad complex needs of our economy in view, rather than relying on a banker's approach of squeezing the money supply and making things tougher and tougher for farmers, working people, and small business while the big corporations just administer their prices upward with every upward move of interest rates. We need the sort of policies that my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] has so ably outlined—policies that will not only encourage instead of choking off economic expansion, but will insure that prosperity is not confined to the few at the expense of the many, will ease instead of increasing the interest-rate burden on consumers and taxpayers, and will reduce the inflationary pressures generated by the banking system instead of adding to them. Such policies, Mr. Speaker, are the sound and responsible alternative to twins of irresponsibility: Government abdication of responsibility for achieving stable price levels on the one hand and the catastrophic application of the high interest money squeeze on the other.

Interestingly enough, the defenders of the tight-money policy do not content themselves with the argument that it is a good policy and one calculated to stem the inflationary tide, they argue at the same time—and evidently in complete ignorance of the obvious contradiction—that the sky high interest rates that they have saddled the taxpayers with relative to the Federal debt are not the result of policy at all, but due to market forces beyond the Government's control. They would have us believe the old myth that money is a commodity like any other commodity and that interest rates are just the market price for money which the Government must pay, like any other borrower. This myth, like that of tight

money as an answer to inflation, needs to be laid to rest once and for all. By now, it must be a very tired myth, worn out from its repeated use by the spokesmen of tight money.

Two points should be made in answer to this myth. The first is that if the interest rate is the price of money, it is clearly one of the most administered prices in our economy, an economy with wide experience of administered prices. This is particularly the case with respect to the interest rate on the Federal debt. It must be remembered that the Federal Government is the largest single borrower in the economy—this fact alone means not only that the interest rate on the Federal debt is not just the result of imaginary free-market forces, but that the rate the Federal Government pays tends to set the rates in the rest of the economy. It must also be remembered that the market for Federal securities is channeled through an extremely small group of dealers—17 in number—which hardly serves to provide the sort of competitive market in which one need have no fear of administered prices, which is to say administered interest rates.

The second and more basic point to be made is that those who argue that the Government is, or should be, unable to follow positive policies aimed at stabilizing interest rates at reasonable levels, are in reality arguing for an abdication by Government of a basic responsibility. Total net debt in our economy, public and private, rose to almost \$850 billion last year and is probably in excess of \$900 billion by now. Obviously this is a major factor in our economy and if we are to fulfill our responsibilities under the Employment Act of 1946 we can hardly ignore the effects of interest rates nor can we refuse to follow policies which are designed to deal with those effects. Again, this is particularly true with regard to the Government's own debt. That we have consistently recognized this responsibility is attested to by the long line of legislation on the subject through our Nation's history, and not least by the act establishing the Federal Reserve System as a creature of the Congress. Does anyone deny the power and duty of the Congress to regulate our banking system as a necessary exercise of our constitutional duty to regulate money? Of course not. And when the spokesmen of this administration argue that the Federal Reserve is somehow mystically "independent," and they are challenged, their reply really boils down to an endorsement of the current policies of the Federal Reserve System. This at least has the virtue of putting the argument where it belongs—in terms of which policies are the best for the Nation. The administration is, in effect, saying that they endorse the policies of the bankers on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve—and this is hardly surprising since their own Treasury Department consistently follows policies in line with the same philosophy.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of our being powerless to effect interest rates—it is a question of what

sort of policies we want to follow. It is an argument between policies which have worked well in the past, stabilizing the management of the Federal debt at reasonable interest rates, thus serving to encourage healthy economic growth and prevent skyrocketing interest rates in the rest of the economy as well as the inflationary push that flows from it, and policies which have proved disastrous over the past 7 years. It is an argument between the reforms which many of us have repeatedly called for and are continuing to call for and those policies which have already cost all of us unnecessary billions in added interest charges and would have cost taxpayers still more billions over the coming years had we surrendered earlier this year to the plea for a repeal of our interest ceiling guideline.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This discussion brings to mind some remarks made by the Under Secretary of the Treasury at the University of Wisconsin School of Banking on the 18th of August 1960. The spokesman for the Treasury made clear there were three debt management purposes on the part of the Treasury.

The first, which sounds logical, to manage the debt in a manner that will assure the orderly growth of the economy. He says:

To do this it should try, except in periods of recession, to place as much of the debt as possible outside of the commercial banks—apart from temporary bank underwriting. Restraint should be exercised in the amount of long-term securities issued, particularly in a recession period, in order not to preempt an undue amount of the new savings needed to support an expansion of the economy.

The second deals with a balanced maturity structure; and the third basic purpose is to borrow as cheaply as possible, which he says must be balanced against the broader consideration of the public interest.

Now, would the gentleman say, as he is a competent student of this subject, that in a period of recession there is some reason for not selling long-term Government bonds when there is no other strong demand for long-term funds?

Mr. REUSS. That is precisely the time when they should be sold. That is the time when there is the greatest amount of loanable funds on hand seeking employment. I cannot see any reason to refrain from selling bonds when interest rates are low, other than a masochistic desire on the part of certain officials to raise the interest rate on the public debt, and to saddle the taxpayers with these long-term obligations. I do not know what is so wrong with a low-interest coupon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Would the gentleman say that the third point made by the Under Secretary, that they should borrow as cheaply as possible, would support this as the proper time to borrow in the long-term market, especially in light of the second point,

which was to lengthen out and balance the maturity structure? Would it not seem reasonable to the gentleman for the Treasury to seek to place its long-term commitments at a time when these commitments could be made at the lowest possible coupon rate rather than at the time of the highest interest rates? Would not the best policy be to put them out when they could borrow as cheaply as possible?

According to the Treasury's own argument that it should borrow as cheaply as possible, it would seem to me the best argument for the course of action the gentleman from Wisconsin is proposing; namely, that the Treasury be encouraged to place more long-term debt at times of low interest rates, instead of encouraging long-term debt only at high interest rates. The Congress insisted last year that it should, during high-interest periods, settle momentarily for short-term commitments, so that the public would not be saddled with very expensive 30- or 40-year commitments at peak interest rates.

Does not the gentleman believe that is a proper fulfillment of the third criterion I have read from the Under Secretary's list of criteria?

Mr. REUSS. That third criterion of the Secretary of the Treasury that the gentleman from Colorado had just read; namely, that the Treasury ought to borrow at the lowest possible interest rates, is one unfortunately honored in the breach by this administration. They have not paid the slightest attention to that criterion and, as the gentleman from Texas has pointed out, the taxpayer is the loser by billions of dollars. I wish they would pay some attention to that third criterion but, from the Under Secretary's speech at Madison, which the gentleman is reading from, it is indicated that they are not going to pay attention to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is distressing that the Treasury can make these arguments for a course of action which we on the Democratic side of the aisle could and do applaud, and then turn around and pursue a course of action which violates the case it has made. For example, from the Treasury's statement of the ownership of public securities for August 1960, one can examine the fluctuation in the placing the debt among commercial banks and other owners. During the last year there was considerable concern about the inflationary threat. I find that the commercial bank holdings in January 1959 were \$68 billion. They fell during the first 9 months of 1959, and they have gone down again this year, currently the commercial banks hold \$56 billion. So we have had bonds going out of the banks during periods of inflation and of recession. It seems to me that there is a hiatus between the asserted purposes and the record which has been made by the Treasury.

It seems to me also, because debt management is essentially a technical area, that the public misses the simply fantastic situation now being proposed, that we refund 2.5 percent loans not due for 8 to 12 years.



The taxpayers are asked to give up 2.5 percent bonds in order to issue what might be 3½-percent bonds.

Mr. REUSS. The Secretary has not stated exactly what coupons he will put out, but if he follows the good old Secretary Humphrey tradition, he will put out the highest possible coupon, which would be detrimental to the taxpayers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A gentleman recently said he was a 200-percent American, having mortgages on both coasts. That makes me a 100-percent American; I have only one mortgage, which is back in Colorado. It was my good fortune to negotiate that mortgage at 4 percent years ago.

Mr. REUSS. I can assure the gentleman from Colorado of his 100-percent Americanism; and if he had more homes, he would have more mortgages.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is no question about that. But not in my wildest dream would I go now to my real estate company and say, "Gentlemen, I would like to renegotiate this mortgage with you" and I will not until the interest rate for new money falls below 4 percent.

If I can go down and get a mortgage at a rate lower than 4 percent, I will refund or sign a new paper any day. But the notion that I would voluntarily go down and say "I would like to pay 5.5 or 6 percent" has never occurred to me. As a responsible Representative of my district, I am distressed to find the Treasury is not being challenged, except by the remarks made here this afternoon, to a proposal that was published in the Wall Street Journal on August 19 that we should take a major portion of outstanding debt costing us only 2.5 percent and call that in and issue a new long-term debt at a much higher rate, at heavy additional cost to the taxpayer.

This seems to me to be robbery in broad daylight. Yet I have heard no criticism, even from the press, about the Treasury having made such a proposal to saddle the taxpayers with a higher rate through refinancing at a higher rate. I am sure there would have been loud screams in protest had this been proposed by a Democratic administration. Congress is asked to levy higher taxes because the Treasury has raised the annual interest cost of the debt \$3 billion. Apparently this new and costly plan will all be done without a whisper, without a single voice of complaint, except the complaint I am making and the gentleman from Wisconsin is making.

Mr. REUSS. It will be interesting if the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post and Times Herald, the AP, the UPI, and the other great services carry the point tomorrow that the gentleman just made—that a raid on the Treasury the likes of which has never been seen before is about to be perpetrated in broad daylight. I shall wait with interest to see whether they pick up this quarter-of-a-billion-dollar point.

The gentleman from Colorado mentioned another very important criterion of fiscal and monetary responsibility, namely, the idea that to the largest

possible extent the ownership of the national debt should be kept out of the hands of the commercial banks, because to the extent that the commercial banks hold the debt, just to that extent is it inflationary. It is interesting to note in that connection that just this month, when the Treasury sold a billion dollars' worth of long-term bonds, \$5 billion worth of applications appeared for those bonds. A large part of that \$5 billion worth of applications was on behalf of so-called savings type investors, individuals, corporations, and so on, other than banks. And, it is interesting to note—and I think somewhat shocking—that the Treasury allotted to savings type investors a mere 25 percent of their total subscription, and thus let into the picture these same commercial banks which, in the eyes of all responsible economists, should not be holding the national debt at all. The Treasury gives no explanation of this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Treasury release of August 12 recites the facts the gentleman refers to, in its Release A-913. Seven thousand seven hundred and fifty million dollars of 3½-percent certificates of indebtedness were subscribed in the amount of \$17,388 million and \$1 billion of 3½-percent bonds due May 15, 1968, were subscribed in the amount of \$5,183 million. Now, would it not seem to the gentleman that the Treasury, in light of its repeatedly professed concern that the length of the debt be extended, should have placed more of the debt into long-term securities? The Treasury might well have guessed a little better on the acceptability of the long-term bonds in the kind of a market we are now experiencing. It might well have used this opportunity to have permitted a larger portion of the bids for bonds to be honored and not have sought to place so much of the debt into the \$7,750 million of certificates due on August 1, 1961, barely a year away.

It would seem to me in face of the subscriptions that were received this month—and in face of the Treasury briefing of the Committee on Banking and Currency last year on lengthening the maturity on the debt—that the Treasury has allowed practice in the past month to betray its professions of last year. And, I wonder in connection with these interest rates if the Treasury remembers that last year we were told by them that our refusal to permit them to sell more long-term Government bonds was driving interest rates way up? We said for the Treasury to pay the higher rates temporarily, for the rate will go down again.

Today the Treasury long-term bonds have lower yields. The highest current yield I see in the New York Times list published Thursday, August 25, as of yesterday's market, shows the highest to be 3.88 percent in this list on bonds; and on shorter bills the highest yield I see quoted is 2.83 percent.

It seems to me that the Treasury's old request of the President, and his request of us on Monday of this week, is very strange—strange that we should be asked again to raise the ceiling on in-

terest rates in the face of a market condition which is known to any reader of market statistics. For the market report shows it is perfectly obvious that the Treasury is not being hamstrung by a 4¼-percent ceiling and driven into the short-term market.

We were told last year that the Treasury could not sell long-term bonds under our 4¼-percent ceiling. At this time, this year, the 4¼-percent ceiling is of no significance at all. Obviously that is so, because the Treasury reports an over-subscription of 500 percent, and not of any 4¼-percent bonds, but of 3½ percent.

So it would seem to me under present circumstances that the Treasury might now match its loud protestations of last year by action to place a larger portion of the debt in long-term securities. Moreover, as the gentleman suggests, in making its allotments—to use the Treasury's own phrase—subscriptions for bonds from savings-type investors and Government-invested accounts were allotted 25 percent. It would seem to me, in the face of the Treasury's professed concern to place these securities in the hands of the savings-type investors, that the Treasury might have put a much higher portion of the allotments into the hands of those who are indeed savings-type investors than their own release indicates they have been doing.

In light of the recent history, the taxpayers can be thankful that Congress did not permit the Treasury to issue billions of dollars' worth of 5-percent bonds for 20 or 30 years. Our action then at least prevented that raid on the Treasury.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Addressing myself to the gentleman from Colorado, he was completely misleading everybody by trying to compare yield with interest rate. The gentleman certainly knows that there is an entirely different situation to be had there. You may have a yield of one thing and an interest rate of another. That accounts for the differences in some of the quotations which the gentleman read. I think the gentleman should at least be honest with the House in making these comparisons.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In its market effect, there might be a difference of an eighth of a point, a fraction, but that is not significant in the light of the issues with which we have been dealing.

I want to thank both gentlemen for their remarks, and to comment on just a couple of other points.

The Committee on Ways and Means brought to the House its approval of advance refunding in the past year, which is the basis on which the Treasury now proposes to move a substantial part of the 1968 or 1972 debt forward for 8 or more years at higher rates. At the time congressional approval of the advance refunding was given, I had the impression that the intent was to make it possible for the Treasury to sell new

bonds to people who now hold bonds, but a little before they got to the point of having to liquidate bonds whose term had expired. Is that the gentleman's understanding of advance refunding?

Mr. REUSS. "Advance refunding" is a very broad term. It may mean any calling in of any existing security and its exchange for a new one. I do not think Congress is opposed to "advance refunding" in principle. What it is opposed to is "advance refunding" that is as silly as this proposed advance refunding of the Treasury. If, for example, the Treasury wanted to call in an issue that had perhaps 2 more years to run, and had a 5-percent coupon on it, and issued long-term obligations at 3½ percent, I say that would be an excellent case for advance refunding.

I would applaud the efforts of the Treasury to tidy up its house in that manner. But it makes no sense whatever to take an issue that has 12 years to run, and that has a very favorable coupon on it of 2.5 percent, and say that just because the very sight of a low interest coupon disturbs the present custodian of the Treasury, therefore, the Government is going to call it in and put a high coupon on it. That, I submit, is madness, and very expensive madness, for the Federal taxpayer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Would the gentleman not feel that if the Treasury persists in carrying forward under this power which the Congress has granted it, when its use of that power appears to be a fiscal abuse and a fiscal irresponsibility, then the Congress should be asked in the next session to reexamine the authority which it has this past year conveyed and, perhaps, either withdrawn the authority or put reasonable limits on the authority so that it does not become the occasion for a new fiscal abuse? Would that not seem a reasonable course of action?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, and better still, to try to put into the Treasury people who have an interest in helping the taxpayer for a change, and who are not forever hellbent on getting the national debt saddled with higher and higher interest coupons.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The McLaughlin Banking Corp. publishes a newsletter on economic trends and their impact on business.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks to include several paragraphs from the August 15 newsletter so that the Members may read what this newsletter has to say with respect to the developing downward trend in the American economy, and which puts their interpretation on the changing economic scene.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

#### ECONOMIC TRENDS AND THEIR IMPACT ON BUSINESS

(Prepared Weekly by the Staff of Business News Associates, Inc.)

#### MONEY TALKS

The story on second half business prospects would be told, we said here some weeks

ago, by the action of the money market. Money talks, 'tis agreed, and money has indeed spoken—bearing the word that the seasonal business upturn in the fall isn't going to be anything to write home about this year.

The message has come in several ways. For one thing, rates on short term funds have been skidding for months—3-month Treasury bills recently yielded as little as 2.131 percent, lowest since August 1958, and even at last week's higher 2.215 percent, were far below the 4.5 percent level which prevailed as 1960 began. Rates on other short-term paper have dropped comparably.

Secondly, the Federal Reserve Board, the Nation's money managers, has made clear by its actions in recent weeks the belief that the economy can use a little stimulation. First they trimmed the discount rate from 4 percent to 3½ percent; this was followed by a reduction in the margin requirements on stock purchases from 90 percent to 70 percent. Most significant of all was last week's easing of bank reserve requirements, net effect of which will be to add an estimated \$3.6 billion to the total funds banks can lend.

Since banks, when they have excess funds, tend to employ them in governments or other securities, if not in loans, the Fed's moves are directed at making financing cheaper to stimulate business demand. The Fed is well aware, of course, that any action to give banks more reserves "will provide more water in the horse trough with the knowledge that the horse might not be keen on drinking," as one observer put it.

And that's just what has been happening. With consumers growing more cautious in their credit purchases, homebuilding far below expectations thus trimming the need for mortgage money and businessmen trying to slow the pace of inventory accumulation, the overall demand for funds has been well below what had been looked for. Since July 1, for example, commercial and industrial loans outstanding nationally have skidded \$664 million, compared to an increase of \$103 million in the same period of last year.

Thus, the most the Fed's new easy-money policy is likely to do is to cut the cost of borrowing in certain areas—it can't be expected to immediately stimulate demand for funds. But by exerting pressure for more available and lower-cost funds, the Fed is laying the groundwork for the next surge in business activity.

#### POLITICS AND ECONOMICS

Midsummer economic trends are giving the Nixon campaign team some concern. Some important lead indicators are showing further weakness this month, although overall business activity held its own, and the administration's advisers cling to the view that a very gradual expansion will continue through the fall.

Members of the Vice President's organization are painfully aware, however, that a downturn—already heralded by unionist Walter Reuther as the "third Eisenhower-Nixon recession"—could damage Nixon's chances of winning the November election. Some are grumbling privately at the apparent unconcern of the White House.

Actually, President Eisenhower has paved the way for stimulative action if he feels it is warranted. Moreover, many stimulative actions could be taken without waiting on Congress. Placement of military contracts could be speeded up, and the allocation of Federal aid funds could be advanced. Secretary of Commerce Mueller last month gave such a nudge to roadbuilding by allocating to the States—more than a year in advance—the full fiscal 1962 interstate highway construction funds. Whether there will be more nudges from Washington may depend on the July economic reports now beginning to emerge from the statistical mills, and to the developing mood of businessmen and consumers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who preceded the gentleman from Wisconsin, that is the gentleman from Iowa, had reference to the concern which both parties feel as to the need for maintaining a stable dollar and a stable level of prices. I know the gentleman from Wisconsin is the author of a bill which he has previously referred to this afternoon, which would write into the Employment Act of 1946 language which would clarify the congressional intent for stable prices and which, furthermore, relates monetary policy to that goal. I am, myself, the author of a bill to add to goals of the Employment Act of 1946 the maintenance of stable price levels. So both of us share with others their concern for avoiding inflation.

I asked the gentleman from Iowa to refer me to any language in the Republican platform dealing with the concern of the Republican Party as to inflation. I find there are two sentences on page 9 and I call these sentences to the attention of the House.

The Republican Party favors "use of the full powers of government to prevent the scourge of depression and inflation"—and I quote again—"maintenance of a stable dollar as an indispensable means to progress."

A review of the rest of the 30 pages does not disclose any language with respect to what precisely this means. Now to quote, "use the full powers of government" means, of course, I presume, that there is nothing the Republicans would not do to fight inflation. However, in the 7½ years that they have had the opportunity to fight inflation, the only things we have seen them do for sure is to raise interest rates, to increase costs to the homeowner and to the small businessman, to the farmer, to the school districts, and to the city, State, and national taxpayers. They have raised the price of money in the name of an anti-inflation program.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I realize the gentleman is a student of economics and has been an instructor in that field in a great college and university.

I do not pretend that I am his match, especially in discussing every detail of this very important field in our economy; however, I would like to ask the gentleman if the Congress had followed the administration recommendations as far as the budget was concerned, had not overridden vetoes on occasion to spend more money, we would have more money to pay off the debt, would not that in itself have the effect of reducing the interest rate as happened recently following the announcement of the surplus?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I would say to the gentleman that the budgetary impact during the past year upon the interest rate has been very mild. A billion-dollar surplus is far less significant than the monetary course which has been followed.



I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that the surplus to which he alludes is due not so much to Presidential vetoes as to the majority action by the Democratic members of the Appropriations Committee who worked to cut out almost a billion dollars from the President's budget and thus make the surplus possible. May I say also that another billion could have been cut out of the budget by having left the interest rates as they were in 1958. The policies that the administration followed raised the cost of the debt in the past year to the extent that we had to vote for more than a billion-dollar increase in taxes. So I would say, on the contrary, that the monetary policies which have been recommended here on the floor by the Members of the majority party would have in fact permitted a \$2 billion surplus this year rather than a \$1 billion surplus. Therefore, we could agree, because we would have gladly cut the debt further if you would only adopt policies which are suitably related to our concern to reduce the size of the debt.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I realize that I am not competent to argue this question of interest rates as ably as the gentleman from Colorado, but I want to remind him again that the majority party was responsible for spending more money than the administration desired, and I would call particular attention to the public works bill which was passed over the President's veto where we added many projects that did not even meet the requirements laid down by the Congress itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The gentleman is now talking not about last year's budget but about his estimates with respect to some future budget.

The new starts which the Democratic Party insisted on last year were paid for in full, to the last dollar, out of reductions from other appropriations and, therefore, there was no budget impact in the 1960 budget by reason of the action of the Congress.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The gentleman is skirting around my question, I am afraid, and not answering my question. I am pointing out this matter of passing over the President's veto that bill which had in it 67 projects which were not fiscally sound, which did not even meet the requirements Congress itself laid down. To have cut out those items would have amounted to almost \$1 billion saving in itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The gentleman means that we should have cut out all the projects irrespective of their need. To a citizen who wrote me objecting to my action on these flood control and other items, I simply sent a copy of the proceedings and said:

This is what I acted on. It is easy to call it pork barrel if you have never seen a flood. The cost of these projects is less than the damage caused by the floods.

He sent my letter back to me with an endorsement on it that he was for me.

It is poor economy to withhold money from projects when the cost of the project is less than the damage the floods will cause.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The record does not support that view entirely.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I think it might be interesting to point out, since the question has arisen as to the action of the Congress in reference to the budget requests of the President, that in the 8 years the Eisenhower administration has been in existence the Congress, particularly during 6 of the 8 years the Democratic Party was in control of the Congress, the Congress has reduced the President's budget requests in actual appropriations by somewhere between \$12 and \$14 billion. I think this substantial reduction perhaps had something to do with the slight surplus that occurred in the budget this year.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to express appreciation to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the gentleman from Colorado and others who have taken part in this discussion for highlighting for this House, and I think for the country, what could easily become one of the major campaign issues in this fall campaign of 1960. I think the spotlight which has been turned on the Treasury's current effort to replace 2.5-percent bonds, if I understand correctly the presentation of the gentlemen on the floor, with higher interest rate bonds, shows a clear and obvious attempt to raise, in the dying moments of this administration, the interest rate level on these 2.5-percent long-term bonds. I think that disclosure on this floor could become one of the principal campaign issues of the 1960 campaign, and the country owes a high debt of appreciation to the gentlemen who brought this to the attention of the Members of this House.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman, and let me say that, rather than have this a political issue, we would prefer to have it a saving for the taxpayers of the United States. Nothing would make me happier than to have the Treasury announce tomorrow that it has given up this attempt to exchange 2.5-percent U.S. securities, which come due in 1972, and instead is going to get on with the job it ought to be getting on with, of lengthening the current debt, and doing so at the lowest possible interest rate.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If this recent attempt by the Treasury Department gets the attention of the press and the public it should receive, it will arouse as much indignation in the country as Teapot Dome did when that took place. I hope it will arouse the same kind of action in November.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I want to say to the gentleman that the discussion we have had on debt management should be very helpful to many

citizens as well as to Members of Congress in understanding some of the fundamental issues that always face any administration in carrying forward the intent of Congress, as expressed in the Employment Act of 1946.

I would like to point out that there has been recently some indication that the administration is aware that its policies are slipping and there has been a reversal of the direction. For this we are grateful to the Federal Reserve. But I would agree with the gentleman the methods being used are wrong.

For example, what the country needs is more housing to be built. We need more houses than we are producing. Yet one of the actions taken by the Federal Reserve was to lower the margin requirements for the purchase of stock from 90 to 70 percent. Gambling in the stock market does not increase the productivity of the American economy. That same kind of money spent in expansion of our economy would yield benefits to the various communities. The gentleman will recall that last year he and I joined a few others in suggesting that with an inflationary pressure which we were then experiencing, the sharp increase which was also occurring in consumer credit justified a concern about the extent to which Americans were mortgaging their future during inflation to increase the demand for goods.

I noted, for example, both on the floor of the House and in conversations with responsible public officials of this administration, and they agreed, that it would be better to restrict consumer credit during an inflationary period in order that one could relax consumer credit in the event of an economic turn-down, because expansion of consumer credit is one of the easiest ways to stimulate the economy. And, the tragedy is that we were proven right, but no action took place.

When the recession comes, the consumer response is, of course, to pay off debts. So, we are now going into a process of debt liquidation. The administration threw away, by its neglect of the case we were making a year ago, one of the best tools they might have had for facing the economic downturn that is now occurring. The chickens are coming home to roost. This may not be an easy question to explain, but it is nonetheless significant that this failure to have the courage to face the requirements at the time the inflation was going on has now made it impossible for them to face the demands that recession makes.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman pointed to the fact that we are now in an economic trend downward. Would the gentleman agree with me that it is ironic, despite the fact that we are in a downtrend now, that the cost of living under this administration continues to go up? Right in the last half hour there has been handed to me the most recent report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, showing that the cost of living in July went up once again to an alltime high level. I would like the gentleman's comment, if he has a comment, on the quality of the economic performance of this

administration in bringing about an all-time high in the cost of living at the same time that we have something like 5 percent unemployed in this country, and a growth rate scarcely one-third of that of Communist Russia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The gentleman's question is one to which I confess as a person trained in economics, I am almost unable to respond. Never before in history have we associated inflation with depression so consistently. Actually, the unemployed labor force has been ranging between 5½ and 6 percent this year. We never assumed in 1946 that it would go far above 3 percent without corrective action. It makes a mockery of the Republican platform as far as maintaining the stability of our country is concerned. By contrast, the gentleman knows that the Democratic Party in its platform at Los Angeles—and the Republicans had a chance to copy from this; they copied much else—said as follows:

The Republican failure in the economic field has been virtually complete.

Their years of power have consisted of two recessions, in 1953-54 and 1957-60, separated by the most severe peacetime inflation in history.

They have shown themselves incapable of checking inflation. In their efforts to do so, they have brought on recessions that have thrown millions of Americans out of work. Yet even in these slumps, the cost of living has continued to climb, and it is now at an all-time high.

They have slowed down the rate of growth of the economy to about one-third the rate of the Soviet Union.

Over the past 7½-year period, the Republicans have failed to balance the budget or reduce the national debt. Responsible fiscal policy requires surpluses in good times to more than offset the deficits which may occur in recessions, in order to reduce the national debt over the long run. The Republican administration has produced the deficits—in fact, the greatest deficit in any peacetime year in history, in 1958-59—but only occasional and meager surpluses. Their first 7 years produced a total deficit of nearly \$19 billion.

While reducing outlays for essential public services which directly benefit our people, they have raised the annual interest charge on the national debt to a level \$3 billion higher than when they took office. In the 8 fiscal years of the Republican administration, these useless higher interest payments will have cost the taxpayers \$9 billion.

They have mismanaged the public debt not only by increasing interest rates, but also by failing to lengthen the average maturity of Government obligations when they had a clear opportunity to do so.

#### ECONOMIC GROWTH

The new Democratic administration will confidently proceed to unshackle American enterprise and to free American labor, industrial leadership, and capital, to create an abundance that will outstrip any other system.

Free competitive enterprise is the most creative and productive form of economic order that the world has seen. The recent slow pace of American growth is due not to the failure of our free economy but to the failure of our national leadership.

We Democrats believe that our economy can and must grow at an average rate of 5 percent annually, almost twice as fast as our average annual rate since 1953. We pledge ourselves to policies that will achieve this goal without inflation.

Economic growth is the means whereby we improve the American standard of living and produce added tax resources for national security and essential public services.

Our economy must grow more swiftly in order to absorb two groups of workers: The much larger number of young people who will be reaching working age in the 1960's, and the workers displaced by the rapid pace of technological advances, including automation. Republican policies which have stifled growth could only mean increasingly severe unemployment, particularly of youth and older workers.

#### AN END TO TIGHT MONEY

As the first step in speeding economic growth, a Democratic President will put an end to the present high-interest, tight-money policy.

This policy has failed in its stated purpose—to keep prices down. It has given us two recessions within 5 years, bankrupted many of our farmers, produced a record number of business failures, and added billions of dollars in unnecessary higher interest charges to Government budgets and the cost of living.

A new Democratic administration will reject this philosophy of economic slowdown. We are committed to maximum employment, at decent wages and with fair profits, in a far more productive, expanding economy.

The Republican high-interest policy has extracted a costly toll from every American who has financed a home, an automobile, a refrigerator, or a television set.

It has foisted added burdens on taxpayers of State and local governments which must borrow for schools and other public services. It has added to the cost of many goods and services, and hence has been itself a factor in inflation.

It has created windfalls for many financial institutions.

The \$9 billion of added interest charges on the national debt would have been even higher but for the prudent insistence of the Democratic Congress that the ceiling on interest rates for long-term Government bonds be maintained.

#### CONTROL OF INFLATION

The American consumer has a right to fair prices. We are determined to secure that right.

Inflation has its roots in a variety of causes; its cures lies in a variety of remedies. Among those remedies are monetary and credit policies properly applied, budget surpluses in times of full employment, and action to restrain administered price increases in industries where economic power rests in the hands of a few.

A fair share of the gains from increasing productivity in many industries should be passed on to the consumer through price reductions.

#### FULL EMPLOYMENT

The Democratic Party reaffirms its support of full employment as a paramount objective of national policy.

For nearly 30 months the rate of unemployment has been between 5 and 7.5 percent of the labor force. A pool of 3 to 4 million citizens, able and willing to work but unable to find jobs, has been written off by the Republican administration as a normal readjustment of the economic system.

The policies of a Democratic administration to restore economic growth will reduce current unemployment to a minimum.

Thereafter, if recessionary trends appear, we will act promptly with countermeasures, such as public works or temporary tax cuts. We will not stand idly by and permit recessions to run their course as the Republican administration has done.

#### FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

We vigorously reject the notion that America, with a half-trillion-dollar gross national product, and nearly half of the world's industrial resources, cannot afford to meet our needs at home and in our world relationships.

We believe, moreover, that except in periods of recession or national emergency, these needs can be met with a balanced budget, with no increase in present tax rates, and with some surplus for the gradual reduction of our national debt.

To assure such a balance we shall pursue a four-point program of fiscal responsibility.

First, we shall end the gross waste in Federal expenditures which needlessly raises the budgets of many Government agencies.

The most conspicuous unnecessary item is, of course, the excessive cost of interest on the national debt. Courageous action to end duplication and competition among the armed services will achieve large savings. The cost of the agricultural program can be reduced while at the same time prosperity is being restored to the Nation's farmers.

Second, we shall collect the billions in taxes which are owed to the Federal Government but not now collected.

The Internal Revenue Service is still suffering from the cuts inflicted upon its enforcement staff by the Republican administration and the Republican Congress in 1953.

The administration's own Commissioner of Internal Revenue has testified that billions of dollars in revenue are lost each year because the Service does not have sufficient agents to follow up on tax evasion.

We will add enforcement personnel, and develop new techniques of enforcement, to collect tax revenue which is now being lost through evasion.

Third, we shall close the loopholes in the tax laws by which certain privileged groups legally escape their fair share of taxation.

Among the more conspicuous loopholes are depletion allowances which are inequitable, special consideration for recipients of dividend income, and deductions for extravagant business expenses which have reached scandalous proportions.

Tax reform can raise additional revenue and at the same time increase legitimate incentives for growth, and make it possible to ease the burden on the general taxpayer who now pays an unfair share of taxes because of special favors to the few.

Fourth, we shall bring in added Federal tax revenues by expanding the economy itself. Each dollar of additional production puts an additional 18 cents in tax revenue in the National Treasury. A 5-percent growth rate, therefore, will mean that at the end of 4 years the Federal Government will have had a total of nearly \$50 billion in additional tax revenues above those presently received.

By these four methods we can sharply increase the Government funds available for needed services, for correction of tax inequities, and for debt or tax reduction.

Much of the challenge of the 1960's, however, remains unforeseen and unforeseeable.

If, therefore, the unfolding demands of the new decade at home or abroad should impose clear national responsibilities that cannot be fulfilled without higher taxes, we will not allow political disadvantage to deter us from doing what is required.

And, as one who sat on the platform committee, I can assure the House that there was not the slightest coercion nor were we dictated to by any candidate or combination of candidates meeting in Washington, New York, or Chicago. Those of us who were elected to the platform committee sat down together at Los Angeles, reached an agreement, and endorsed this platform that went to the entire convention, and there was no



question on this. There was unanimity of opinion. This was due to the fact that we had asked the American people in the full public hearings we had, and we had all their suggestions summarized, and copies of those summaries were in our hands.

These hearings and these summaries made it clear that the American people do not want to fight inflation with only the jawbone. They want serious action. We have an entire program which the Democratic Party will endorse and I am confident that the Democratic administration will again have the kind of courage, in January, to face this issue.

I speak as one who served as part of the Democratic administration of Franklin Roosevelt, in the Executive Office of the President, during the years 1942 to 1944, in the fiscal division, when this was a very real problem. I have seen the Democratic administration from the inside face far more rigorous economic problems than this administration has ever faced and I have seen that administration meet them. Therefore, I am confident, not just from reading history, but from living with history, that the next Democratic administration will again discharge its responsibilities competently and wisely, conscious of its need to promote and maintain maximum employment, production and purchasing power at stable price levels. It will fight inflation effectively without stifling the economy in the process.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

#### INSURING MORE EQUITABLE TREATMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS IN GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members of the Congress share my growing concern with the steady erosion of the percentage of the military dollar placed with small business.

The statistics are all too familiar to the Congress. I shall not repeat them except to say that during fiscal year 1959, for example, I am told that of \$22½ billion—the net value of military prime contracts—almost 74 percent was awarded to 100 companies—20 of which received a shade over one-half of this \$22½ billion. I am told that in 1954 small business received about 25 percent of military prime contract dollars, but that in fiscal year 1959, this share has decreased to an inadequate 16.6 percent. I am also informed that there is little prospect that this alarming decline will be reversed in the foreseeable future.

Time and time and time again, in legislation, in committee reports, and on the floors of the House and Senate, Congress has declared its clear desire that small business be granted a fair opportunity to participate in and contribute to our defense programs and receive a fair proportion of the military

procurement dollar. Nevertheless, this mandate, if it has not been ignored, has not been carried out. Sixteen percent, in my opinion, is not a fair share. Small business is not participating equitably in our defense programs.

I am told that the decline in the small business share of the military procurement dollar is inevitable because of the necessity to utilize the so-called weapons system method of procurement, and because most, if not all, of the weapons which the military now buys are beyond the capacity of smaller firms to produce. This may be true, Mr. Speaker, but only in part. I have not seen any notable increase in the small business share of those contracts which the military say is within the small business potential. I have not seen any increase in the small business participation in the defense program at the subcontracting level. And I have not seen any evidence of sympathetic and aggressive action by the Department of Defense to increase, at any level, small business' participation in our defense programs.

The failure of the contracting agencies to carry out the congressional small business mandates is aggravated by increasing resort to the weapons system method of procurement. The laws which the Congress has enacted to implement the Federal small business policies have their greatest impact upon the Federal procurement officials. Private contractors who have received large Government contracts are free to ignore Federal small business policies in the letting of subcontracts unless they are required to conform to these policies either by the terms of their prime contracts with the Government or by statutes enacted by the Congress. We have not seen, to date, any effective implementation of small business policies below the prime contract level. Adherence to these policies is not required by law. Nor has this requirement been effectively written into Government contracts by our procurement officials. The result is that today there is no effective small business program below the prime contract level.

There is pending before this House the latest expression of the continuing desire of the Congress that small business share equitably in this country's immense defense effort. I refer to H.R. 11207 amending the Small Business Act. This legislation has been passed by the House of Representatives. An amendment in the nature of a substitute was adopted by the Senate. I urge most sincerely that section 8 be considered favorably in conference and that the House adopt the Senate amendment in the final conference report.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House, section 8 of H.R. 11207, added to the bill by the Senate. This particular provision was sponsored, I understand, by Members of both sides of the aisle in the other Chamber; it was reported out unanimously by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee; and it was passed by the Senate without objection. Section 8 of H.R. 11207 amends the Small Business Act to require that the Small Business Adminis-

trator after consultation with the Administrator of General Services and the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Supply and Logistics—promulgate an effective program to enable small concerns to participate in defense contracts at the subcontracting level. This program is then to be embodied in certain prime contracts and subcontracts administered by the Government procurement agencies including the Department of Defense.

The theory behind this legislation is simple. If small business cannot participate equitably in contracts issued by the Government at the prime contract level, it then becomes increasingly important for the Congress to take steps to assure that its small business mandate will be effective at the subcontracting level. Under section 8, SBA is required to consult with the procurement agencies and in this process of consultation to formulate a small business subcontracting program which will carry out the desires of the Congress. When such a program has been devised—except for such assistance as SBA may be able to render to contractors in connection with the program—SBA's duties are completed. The requirements of the subcontracting program are incorporated in appropriate Government contracts and it is the duty of the contracting agencies, not SBA, to carry out the program. This represents no change from present practice.

I am aware, of course, that there have been objections to the provisions of section 8. I have heard that the enactment of these provisions will slow down the procurement process and delay acquisition of urgently needed military equipment. I am told that it will tend to increase procurement costs and it will cause great confusion and uncertainty in the procurement programs. I have heard a host of other accusations for which I can find no basis in the provisions of H.R. 11207.

Mr. Speaker, these protests have been made against every effort on the part of the Congress to provide legislation to increase small business participation in military procurement. Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress to look through these objections to the substance of this legislation.

The Congress, I note, concurs in the object of this legislation. But the Congress is not alone in this desire. The Bureau of the Budget agrees that the objective of the legislation is desirable. The SBA has recommended this type of legislation. Even the Department of Defense has expressed support for the objective.

I have examined section 8 in the light of the objections made to it, including the objections of the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. The objections to the legislation are based on the form rather than the aim. It seems to me that they are predicated either on a misunderstanding of the provisions of section 8 or on an unreasonable fear that the Small Business Administration suddenly will declare its independence of the executive branch, of control by the President, the Bureau of

the Budget, and others, and against the counsel of the Department of Defense and the General Services Administration announce a radical small business subcontracting program.

This fear, of course, is not well founded. SBA, as this Congress well knows, has in the past proved amenable to the needs and desires of the Department of Defense to a degree which exceeds, perhaps, the desires of this Congress.

I think that the terms of section 8 are reasonable. I think that the fears of the opponents of section 8 are exaggerated. I see no reason why a sensible small business subcontracting program developed in consultation with the procurement agencies and administered by these procurement agencies should delay or interfere with the procurement process. I, therefore, do urge this House to give favorable consideration to the passage of H.R. 11207. I also say this—if in the view of the Members the present provisions of section 8 grant to SBA authority to establish a small business subcontracting program that is too broad—then let this authority be modified and limited by adding, in conference with the Senate, appropriate changes to section 8. Let us not miss this opportunity to enact significant legislation which will carry forward the principle with which we all agree—those of us in the Congress and the executive agencies as well—that the small business share in Government procurement shall be increased to an equitable share in Government procurement.

#### JUSTICE FOR THE DAIRY FARMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, a goodly number of dairy farmers in our Eighth Pennsylvania District of Bucks and Lehigh Counties are currently confronted with a trying problem that, in my humble judgment, demands the study and attention of the Congress because it stands out as a disturbing example of enforcement by an administrative agency of a law in a manner that contravenes what, I believe, was the legislative will and intent of Congress.

Specifically, I refer to the difficulties into which many of our dairy farmers in eastern Pennsylvania have been projected by New York-New Jersey Federal Marketing Order No. 27 issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. From 1957 to date, more than \$400,000 has been tied up—the sum deposited with a Federal court pending the final disposition of prolonged legal action.

For many years, the Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers, headquartered in Allentown, and Suncrest Farms, Inc., in our neighboring city of Bethlehem, have been selling packaged milk across the Delaware River into an area in New Jersey, which is not more than 25 miles from Allentown. Indeed, the Warren County area of New Jersey historically has always been regarded as an integral part of the metropolitan trading area of

Easton, Pa., and these dairies were selling milk there long before the long arm of a Federal agency reached in to seek, by decree, an enforced change in buying habits and established practices.

Beginning August 1, 1957, this area was included by the Department of Agriculture under New York-New Jersey Federal Marketing Order No. 27 which provides that in order for the Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers to continue selling in that market in New Jersey, the company had to pay compensatory payments into the New York-New Jersey market pool—payments that averaged better than 5 cents a quart on all of the milk supplied from Lehigh Valley to that area. In consideration of the fact that Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers is and for a long time has been the largest distributor of packaged milk in Warren County, N.J.—which is all it is involved in even though the aforementioned marketing order covers all northern New Jersey counties—this is very properly regarded by the member dairy farmers as a punitive and unfair decree which forces them to pay tribute for the right to sell milk in that area. It is a particularly mean pill to swallow in light of the fact that the cooperative farmers earned the patronage of Warren County people long before this order was arbitrarily laid down. It is quite obvious that this is an effort to eventually force the cooperative farmers out of an area where their milk products have long enjoyed widespread public acceptance. To me this stands out, as it must to you, as a rather untenable example of Government by administrative decree with little or no regard for individual enterprise or the rights that properly belong to those who merit such a privilege by dint of their own labors in a free economy.

I should like to point out that the Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers-Suncrest case does not have the effect of invalidating all orders with a like provision, nor does it rule out compensatory payments as such. I say this because those who are seeking to uphold the application of Order No. 27 to this particular case make the claim that an adverse ruling would jeopardize some 50 such marketing orders. Permit me to observe that in the U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania, opinion handed down under date of April 25 this year by Judge Thomas Clary, it was pointed out that such a conclusion is unfounded. The issue at stake here is whether milk could be bought for the so-called class III price. Page 23 of the court's opinion stated:

The Government cannot argue (nor has it attempted to argue) that the total cost to the plaintiff (Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers and Suncrest Farms, Inc.) of the liquid milk which they sell in northern New Jersey is equal to the costs of its competitors. There is definite evidence to show that the cost of raw milk to these dairies is, in fact, substantially higher than the order No. 27 uniform class III price classification.

These two dairies have testified that they support classification price. They do not favor cheap milk being dumped

into any marketing area. They are not opposed to cut-rate milk being kept out of the market. Indeed, they offered a plan for compensatory payments which would prevent this very thing while simultaneously accomplishing uniformity of price to handlers. They have proposed that the Marketing Administrator price their milk at his price, that is order No. 27 price, and that if these dairies paid less, the order should provide that they pay into the settlement fund the difference whereas if they pay more, as they are now doing, or the same, then they would owe the settlement fund nothing. What could be fairer?

There are some orders, actually, that entail this very kind of provision which accomplishes the real purpose of the marketing order, namely, to place all on an equal footing and at the same time keep cut-rate milk out of the market.

Since this order was issued more than 3 years ago, the Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers has contested it through regular legal proceedings. The Department of Agriculture asked for an injunction in the U.S. district court in Philadelphia to compel the cooperative to file monthly reports to the New York-New Jersey Market Administrator, and also to make payments to the New York-New Jersey market pool each month. By virtue of a temporary decision handed down in the Federal court, the cooperative is compelled to pay the money each month to the registry of the court in Philadelphia until a final decision is rendered. This money has been withheld from each of the producers who together make up the cooperative and costs them from 6 cents to 15 cents a hundredweight each month on all of the milk they deliver to the Allentown plant. Each producer is notified each month of the amount being withheld. In such fashion has an unhappy situation developed whereby these dairy farmers now have had withheld from them a sum totaling more than \$400,000.

It has now been three years since this order became effective. It is also unmistakably obvious that the legal procedures required to obtain relief from the inequities of Federal market orders are confusing, complicated, costly, and time consuming. Indeed, it is well-nigh impossible for anyone who feels that he is being unfairly dealt with by these orders to get any speedy and equitable decision on an appeal.

It is this kind of procedure that in my judgment demands the prompt attention of Congress. Certainly the time is at hand when farmers such as these dairy producers should not be penalized and regimented against by their own Government. Here is a case of Federal orders being applied in a way that is extremely harmful to the smaller cooperatives in the country, operating in limited areas and who have to compete with the large corporations in the industry in the marketing of their milk. It has been the experience of the Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers over the last 26 years that the Pennsylvania Milk Control Commission has done a good deal more for our Pennsylvania dairy



farmers in getting them a fairer price for milk than either the New York marketing order or the Philadelphia marketing order promulgated by the Federal Government. Here we see a self-reliant small business type of operation being burdened by the heavy hand of Federal regulation in an area of regulation already covered quite adequately by a State agency.

This Federal order is discriminatory and does not, in my opinion, carry out the declared intentions of Congress. Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers has been in the Phillipsburg, N.J., area more than a quarter century. It did not invade the marketing area of order No. 27. Quite the contrary, the order pushed itself into a market historically that of the Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers with the effect of trying to push the cooperative out of the market or compelling it to pay more, by as much as \$2.50 to \$3 a hundredweight, than its competitors. I remind you again that Phillipsburg is part of the Metropolitan Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton area. By no stretch of the imagination can it, nor has it ever been, part of the commercial metropolitan area of New York or northern New Jersey.

What the Department of Agriculture is trying to do is to compel a nonpool producer to pay a price higher than the class III price and then pay into the producer settlement fund the difference between class III and class 1A in the face of the undeniable fact that the cooperative pays more to its producers than the class 1A price under order No. 27. This makes the provision even less justifiable.

The argument is advanced by the Department of Agriculture that if the cooperative did not sell its milk as fluid milk in the Phillipsburg area it would have to put it in class III. This has little validity because it assumes that producers shipping to pool handlers have the preempted and monopolistic right to the fluid market in the Phillipsburg area. This is an unwarranted and altogether unrealistic conclusion.

This case has a long legal history—one that has resulted in great expense to the dairy farmers located in our Lehigh Valley. It has dragged along more than 3 years. It was heard before the hearing examiner in New York in October 1957. Eight months later, in July 1958, the hearing examiner rendered a clearcut decision in favor of the cooperative and ordered the payments which the dairy had made returned to it. Furthermore, in his decision he questioned the legality of the order issued and significantly declared that the hearings with respect to the issuance of the order were illegal because of their not being instituted in accordance with regulations.

Under the law, after the hearing examiner makes his decision in a case of this nature, it must be brought before the Judicial Officer in the Department of Agriculture. It wasn't until almost 3 months after the hearing examiner had made his report that the Judicial Officer in the Department of Agriculture decided to hear this case. Not until 8 months later did the Judicial Officer

finally reach a decision that reversed the hearing examiner. The effect of this long-drawn-out delay inside the Department of Agriculture was to pull the case back to the U.S. district court in Philadelphia for another hearing. In December 1959, the U.S. district court in Philadelphia called the case for hearing. But the Department of Agriculture asked for an extension of time, saying they were not ready to have the case heard. So it was postponed again until February 16 of this year at which time Judge Clary heard evidence in the U.S. district court in Philadelphia. Judge Clary subsequently handed down an opinion, dated April 25 this year, which upheld the position of Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers and said, among other things:

There is real doubt as to whether it—the Government—in fact contends that Lehigh Valley should be required to make payments.

One of the inconsistencies in this whole procedure is that the Department of Agriculture is in effect sitting as both the judge and jury of its own policies. It is an amazing and almost frightening illustration of what seems to me to be regulatory powers that go far beyond the original intent of Congress. I remind you again that this is a case of a small cooperative of dairy farmers being required by the Government that is supposed to protect it to pay "tribute" for the right to do business in an area historically and properly belonging to the cooperative. Here is a case that was heard before one of the Department's own examiners. The dairy won the case. The Department then turns around and files exceptions which it places before one of its own employees who sits as a judicial officer—who, in effect, sits in judgment on his own employer's policy.

At the present time, the Department is appealing Judge Clary's decision to the United States Third Circuit Court of Appeals. Not only is the Government seeking to enforce its battle against this modest-sized cooperative, but it has been joined by the Dairymen's League and two other New York State cooperatives who have been granted permission to intervene against Judge Clary's rule that Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers and Suncrest Farms, Inc. are not required to make payments into the New York pool for the difference between class 1 and class 3 prices.

Small wonder that the dairy farmers of the Lehigh Valley feel they are being called upon to fight the combined strength of their own Government and a combine of giant competition as well. It is a situation that cries for redress and remedial action on the part of the Congress.

For this reason I have today offered a resolution for the consideration of the Congress calling for a study of this marketing problem. It is my hope that prompt action will be taken.

#### VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, when Kipling wrote:

It's Tommy this, and Tommy that, 'an  
"Chuck 'im out, the brute!"

But it's "Savior of 'is country," when  
The guns begin to shoot.

he might have been foreseeing the difficulties a modern veteran has in maintaining the rights he has earned by public service. While the shooting lasts, no one is so patriotic and so deserving of his country's best as the man who takes up arms in defense of liberty and righteousness. But when the danger is over, it is easy for some politicians to yield to the ignoble plea for economy when it comes to sharing in the handicaps imposed on the veteran by his service. Men are willing to spend uncounted billions while their own lives and their own property are in danger, but prefer to dole out dollar by dollar a due meed to those who have committed their all to the struggle.

Ancient wars were fought by professional soldiers. War was their trade and profession. Whatever reason they had for entering the service, they probably expected to profit from it as they would from any other occupation. Modern wars, at least in the United States, are fought by citizen soldiers. These leave their occupations and their most cherished dreams at the call of duty and respond to the needs of an imperiled nation. They are true patriots. It is foolish to say they had no choice, that a nationwide conscript system summoned them to service. The conscript system met with practically universal approval in the wars of this century. Each man said, in effect, that he dedicated his life to the particular activity most useful to his country at the moment, whether in the Armed Forces, in the workshop, or in some other form of preparation or of service. Those who were chosen for the Armed Forces responded without hesitation and without complaint.

The citizen soldier, under the most happy circumstances, was compelled to delay his entry into the civilian life to which he hoped to return. While others advanced their interests in peacetime life, he was absorbed in protecting the common interest. A delayed start in civil life was in itself a handicap. In addition, the soldier incurred risks far beyond the hazards of everyday living. Many of them, in the words of Capt. John Smith, "did all that men could do, and when they could do no more, they left their bodies in testimony of their minds." Others were broken in body or in mind, and rendered partly unfit for the fierce competition of modern industrialism. Loved ones dependent on their efficiency and usefulness are handicapped along with the veterans themselves.

It is true that a more or less grateful country has provided a number of benefits to help overcome the handicaps incurred by all returning soldiers. Provisions for education, for hospitalization, for insurance, for housing, for job training, and so on down the line, probably exceed those in any other period of history. Some of these benefits are eroded

by time and by inflation. Then the specious plea of economy is brought forward to halt the Nation's real purpose to see that those who have served well their country may find their opportunities for success equalized with those who are not handicapped. Or, quibblings about service-connected and non-service-connected handicaps confuse the issue.

As a disabled veteran of nearly 4 years service during World War II, I want to assure all those who have answered their Nation's call, their widows, orphans and dependents, that as long as I am in the Congress of the United States I will be constantly on guard to protect their interests and the interests of their loved ones. This guard must be kept until the full debt of gratitude of an appreciative Republic has been paid to the last detail.

#### NOISE PROBLEM FROM LOW-FLYING AIRCRAFT AT NEW YORK CITY AIRPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, I spoke in this House about the increasing concern with the problem of noise from low-flying aircraft at the New York City airports. Round the clock flights roaring only a short distance above the households in Queens County, where both Idlewild and La Guardia Airports are located, are taking a constant toll of sleep and rest from the thousands upon thousands of residents in the area.

In my remarks I suggested a seven point program of administrative and legislative remedies to alleviate the hazardous condition which exists in the skies above Long Island. Although both the Federal Aviation Agency and the New York Port Authority have adopted regulations designed to ease the noise problem the effects of such action have been slight, primarily because there has been a failure to clearly delineate lines of jurisdiction between the agencies so that adequate measures can be taken and because penalties for the violation of regulations have not been severe enough nor have they been strongly enforced. As a result, the hundreds of thousands of weary, red-eyed residents—already worn out from lack of sleep—are being lobbed back and forth between the Federal and local agencies like ping-pong balls.

The worsening situation remains unchecked and the distress grows, as tired, anguished residents are nightly buffeted by the whine and shriek from the jet engines on the great commercial airliners.

This shameful situation can be corrected by vigorous action. This is what I sought when I spoke in June. This is what I seek now.

The administrative remedies which I suggested were, first, the banning of jet flights between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.—jet flights at night are banned at the London Airport—second, a lowering of the previously set maximum ceiling of 112 perceived noise decibels—125 can cause deafness—third, the banning of jet warmups at night unless absolutely necessary, and the mandatory construction of noise abating jet warmup facilities such as walls, earthenbanks or buildings to lessen noise during the daytime, fourth, more feasible runway use patterns by jets to minimize flights over residential areas, and fifth, the planting of thick groves of trees on the outskirts of the airports as a baffle to jet noises.

The legislative suggestions were, first, action by the House Rules Committee to report out House Resolution 162, the resolution of my Queens colleague Congressman BOSCH, for the creation of a select committee to determine the areas of jurisdiction of both the FAA and the port authority, in order to secure vigorous enforcement of noise abating regulations respectively adopted by the two agencies, and second, action by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on my own bill, H.R. 12894, to grant specific authority to the FAA over the noise abatement problem and to provide for heavy penalties, including suspension of flight permits, for violations of such FAA regulations.

Of these recommendations only one, that of altering flight patterns, has actually been put into effect. By itself it cannot relieve the situation.

I sent these suggestions to the FAA and received a reply from Brig. Gen. Paul T. Preuss, Assistant Administrator for Plans. I insert this letter in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,  
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1960.

Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALPERN: This is in response to your letter of June 30, 1960, concerning the aircraft noise problem in the Idlewild Airport area.

We fully recognize that the existing noise abatement procedures in the Idlewild Airport do not completely solve the problem and we are actively seeking additional safe, practical methods to further reduce it. We are hopeful that the completion of the extension of runway 31 left will greatly increase the traffic flexibility at Idlewild, thus providing a greater measure of relief to area residents.

The point brought up in your letter concerning the engine runup problem requires some rather detailed analysis. As you know, the Federal laws prior to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 did not provide authority for control by Federal administrative agencies of aircraft noise. It was not provided until the enactment of section 307(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 where Congress gave the Administrator of this Agency the authority in promulgating air traffic rules to consider "the protection of persons and property on the ground." While the legislative history on this provision indicated that it was primarily intended for the protection of persons and property on the ground from aerial hazards resulting from crop dusting and spraying, we have construed this authority, and so testified before congressional

committees, as sufficiently broad to authorize noise abatement regulations. However, it must be noted that this authority is limited to the issuance of air traffic rules. The proposed New York rule is premised on this interpretation. The act does not give authority to the Administrator to directly control all aircraft noise. Hence, it is doubtful that the Administrator could validly issue regulations governing the noise generated by ground runup tests—unless noise reduction in this area is indirectly accomplished in the carrying out of Federal regulations related to aircraft safety. Such control, however, would be of limited value in controlling all ground aircraft noise. For example, in testing aircraft engines on the ground, while not a part of the aircraft, much noise is generated. The authority for control of such ground noise is primarily the responsibility of the local government. I believe that local authorities may, and have the responsibility to, issue lawful reasonable regulations governing ground activities provided they do not conflict with Federal regulations, affect air traffic control, or constitute an undue burden upon interstate commerce. Millions of dollars and man-hours have been expended by the Federal Government and the aviation industry to reduce the noise associated with the operation of aircraft. I am hopeful that a practical solution will be forthcoming.

Your comment concerning curtailment of night operations causes us concern. This Agency by the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is directed to encourage and foster the development of civil aeronautics and air commerce in the United States and abroad. The drastic curtailment or elimination of night operations by an order of the Administrator would not be consistent with this responsibility. Hence, we feel that such action, with the resultant economic repercussions, not only is of concern to this Agency and the aviation industry, but the Congress and the Civil Aeronautics Board as well.

The noise problem is indeed serious and is, next to flight safety, the most critical one faced by this Agency. We are assembling as much data as possible in seeking additional practical methods to reduce the noise nuisance, not only in the New York area, but in other parts of the country as well.

Sincerely,

PAUL T. PREUSS,  
Brigadier General, USAF, Assistant Administrator for Plans.

I regret that this letter is not the forthright answer which those of us who are deeply concerned with the problem expected. As a matter of fact, I do not mind saying I feel thoroughly disgusted with the limited scope of the measures that have thus far been taken. The letter regrettably carries the implication that the FAA is virtually powerless to cope with the matter and places a great share of the responsibility on local authorities. This is the same excuse that we have heard for years, and all the time the volume of noise at the two airports has continued to mount. The time has come to resolve these jurisdictional fine points which are impeding constructive action and to finally pass laws which will bring relief to the jet-deafed homeowners and apartment dwellers living near the New York airports.

Such relief can be obtained by clarifying the jurisdiction of the FAA and the port authority and by strengthening the powers of the FAA over noise-abatement measures. The rules of the FAA are woefully inadequate and it is up to Congress to let it know that we mean busi-



ness. It is up to us to provide it with the authority it now declares that it lacks.

There is yet time for Congress to provide the FAA with the punch it says it needs. I urgently appeal to the Rules Committee to report out House Resolution 162, and to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to report out H.R. 12894. These measures when adopted and enforced can immeasurably alleviate the terrible, energy-sapping noise nuisance. The time for talk is past. We will settle for nothing less than peace and quiet at Idlewild and La Guardia Airports.

#### OSCAR HAMMERSTEIN II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that we learn of the recent passing of Oscar Hammerstein II, one of the best known musical figures of today.

Mr. Hammerstein was a resident of the district which I have the honor and privilege to represent, having his home in a beautiful section of Bucks County on the outskirts of the Borough of Doylestown, Pa. As a resident of this community, Mr. Hammerstein and his charming wife added much to the cultural and civic life of the area.

In the world of music and the theater, Mr. Hammerstein was without a peer. His lyrics were of world renown and set the pattern for the musical culture of our day.

Mr. Hammerstein is a figure who will go down in history for many songs, including such songs as "Ol Man River," "Indian Love Call," "The Last Time I Saw Paris," "Rose Marie," "When I Grow Too Old To Dream," and "Only Make Believe." With Mr. Rodgers, the world was enriched with such songs as "Some Enchanted Evening," "People Will Say We're in Love," and "Oh, What a Beautiful Morning," to mention just a few of the songs which the world has sung and loved over the years.

Mr. Hammerstein worked in collaboration with several great musical figures prior to the formation of the world-famous team of Rodgers and Hammerstein. However, this partnership over the last 18 years has been responsible for many musical hits such as "Oklahoma," "The King and I," "South Pacific," and the last being "The Sound of Music." This last hit, which is presently playing in New York, aptly characterizes this wonderful man. His whole life was enveloped in "The Sound of Music"—beautiful, lilting, American music.

Our hearts are heavy for the grieving family of this well-loved man, but those who love him must have great consolation in the knowledge that Oscar Hammerstein will live on in the memory of all as his gay and beautiful lyrics are heard and enjoyed over the years.

#### WE MUSTN'T FORGET OUR UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS—TWO VITALLY NEEDED PIECES OF LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two pieces of legislation which I believe are vitally needed to provide emergency help and relief to our unemployment areas, especially in view of the President's callous veto of the distressed areas bill for which so many of us fought so hard and so long.

One of these bills would require the Development Loan Fund not merely to insist that dollar loans to foreign countries be spent in this country—which, as I understand it, is already the current administrative policy of the Fund, though it could, of course, be altered by similar administrative action at any time, since it is not included in the appropriate statute—but also that such purchases be channeled as a matter of priority into major unemployment areas, such as those included in the 32d District of New York, which I have the honor to represent.

I believe this is only a matter of simple justice. All of us are aware, of course, that one of the contributing factors to rising unemployment in many areas is cutthroat, low-cost foreign competition. The irony of all this is that in all too many cases this competition has come from countries and industries that were originally able to get back on their feet because of American foreign aid funds paid for by the tax dollars of American working men and women. In other words, American men and women have been paying taxes for the privilege of putting themselves out of a job. How crazy can we get?

Well, at the very least, we should make sure that the vast sums we are spending on foreign aid will be used insofar as possible to make purchases here in the United States and hence help to stimulate as much as possible production to ease the unemployment which foreign competition has helped to create. That is all my bill would do.

Only the other day, the Yugoslavian Government sent a purchasing commission to this country to buy 59 American locomotives with the proceeds of a loan from the Development Loan Fund. I urged the Fund to make certain that these locomotives would be purchased from the Alco Products Co. of Schenectady, N.Y., my home city, the former American Locomotive Co. Alco's locomotive business, the only major part of the company's operations carried on in Schenectady, is now almost nonexistent, and as a result nearly half of the company's employees have been laid off in a city that is already suffering from very heavy unemployment. In fact Schenectady would have been in line for help

under the distressed areas bill if the President had only signed it into law instead of vetoing it. But the Fund told me they had no power to compel the Yugoslavian Government to spend the proceeds of their American loan in an unemployment area. So as a result Schenectady and the Alco locomotive plant were ignored. The business went elsewhere.

To me this just does not make sense. It is not fair. How can we possibly help ourselves if those in authority fail to recognize the need to provide special consideration for our unemployment areas.

Though the hour of this final session of the 86th Congress is late, I feel it is vitally important that we pass this kind of bill before we adjourn.

The other piece of legislation I have introduced would require that in the disposition of Government surplus property special priority consideration be given to purchasers who intend to use such property to undertake manufacturing operations in an area of substantial unemployment, and thereby to increase employment in that area.

I have been informed that many persons desiring to obtain surplus equipment to conduct manufacturing operations in unemployment areas have found themselves stymied in the purchase of this equipment by speculators who are less interested in helping a particular community than in purchasing surplus materials wholesale for later distribution on a retail basis. It is time we gave some special recognition in more than just words of the needs of our unemployed areas. Personally, I would feel that if we can use this material to help stimulate local employment the Government would be way ahead even giving it away free. But my bill is at least a step in the right direction.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the substance of this legislation was suggested to me by leading business leaders in Amsterdam, N.Y., a community that has been suffering from unemployment, but which has also done a magnificent job of trying to help itself get back on its own feet through the industries for Amsterdam program. Surely if we can adopt legislation to help communities to help themselves, then I believe we have an obligation to do it without delay.

I hope both pieces of legislation will be acted on favorably and promptly by this House.

#### MUTUAL SECURITY AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 12619, making appropriations for Mutual Security and related agencies for the fiscal year 1961.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House conferees have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 12580.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

## ASSISTANCE IN DEVELOPMENT OF LATIN AMERICA AND RECONSTRUCTION OF CHILE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H.R. 13021) to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HEMPHILL, for 30 minutes, on Monday.

Mr. FLOOD, for 30 minutes, on Friday.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLYNN, for 1 hour, on tomorrow.

Mr. KASEM, for 15 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. MOORE), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MOORE), for 6 minutes, following Mr. HALPERN, today.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona (at the request of Mr. MOORE), for 1 hour, on Tuesday and Wednesday next.

Mr. RANDALL, for 15 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado), for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, August 30.

Mr. CURTIN, for 5 minutes, today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ULLMAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLYNN and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. MOORE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

(At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mrs. GRANAHAN.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. LIBONATI.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3800. An act to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2339. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 39 of the United States Code, entitled "The Postal Service";

H.R. 5054. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the marking of imported articles and containers; and

H.R. 11666. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

## BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5789. An act to incorporate the Agricultural Hall of Fame.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 26, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2424. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Oroville-Tonasket Unit, Okanogan-Similkameen Division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, pursuant to section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 453); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2425. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report relating to certain violations of administrative control of funds procedures in connection with the obligation of funds in excess of amounts allotted from an appropriation of this Department, as of June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2426. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a supplementary report to reports made on August 30, 1958, and August 1, 1959, relating to the authority

to construct, operate, and maintain the DeLuz Dam on the Santa Margarita River in the State of California, pursuant to Public Law 547, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee of conference. H.R. 4826. A bill for the relief of Arthur E. Collins (Rept. No. 2153). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1870. An act to provide for examination, licensing, registration, and for regulation of professional and practical nurses, and for nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2131. An act to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia approved May 25, 1954, as amended, without amendment (Rept. No. 2155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 624. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12677, taking the bill from the Speaker's table and sending it to conference; without amendment (Rept. No. 2156). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. H.R. 6597. A bill to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes, (Rept. No. 2157). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 7198. A bill to authorize the construction of waste disposal facilities to reduce the pollution of the Potomac River from storm water overflows, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 13066. A bill to amend section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 13067. A bill to amend Public Law 86-619, an act to make uniform provisions of law with respect to the terms of office of the members of certain regulatory agencies, approved July 12, 1960; without amendment (Rept. No. 2161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTS: Committee of conference. H.R. 6871. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a public health training program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2162). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 13021. A bill to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 12619. A bill making appropriations for Mutual Security and related agencies for the



fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2164). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 12580. A bill to extend and improve coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and material and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the unemployment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2165). Ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 12503. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Carolina Freight Carriers Corp., a corporation of the State of North Carolina, of certain lands and any improvements thereon located in Bibb County, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARMON:

H.R. 13145. A bill to require that newspapers give equal space to all political candidates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 13146. A bill to authorize Federal assistance for the establishment of a poultry research laboratory to serve the \$250 million poultry industry in the Delmarva Peninsula area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 13147. A bill to present a declaration of objectives for senior Americans; provide for the establishment of a U.S. Office of Aging within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to be headed by an Assistant Secretary for Aging; authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older

persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 13148. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, to provide that priority shall be given in sales of surplus property to persons planning to utilize such property in areas of substantial labor surplus in such ways as to increase employment in such areas; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 13149. A bill to amend section 202 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 so as to require that dollar funds made available to foreign countries by the Development Loan Fund for the purchase of materials or supplies shall be utilized for the purchase of materials or supplies produced in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 13150. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 13151. A bill for the relief of the Capitol Hill merchants; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 800. Joint resolution to improve farm income for producers of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed by establishing a payment-in-kind program and increasing the resale price of surplus Government stocks of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.J. Res. 801. Joint resolution to improve farm income for producers of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed by establishing a payment-in-kind program and increasing the resale price of surplus Government stocks of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H. Res. 625. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Agriculture to conduct a study of the issuance of milk-marketing orders; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 626. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Res. 627. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to investigate political activity within the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 628. Resolution to establish a House Committee on Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 13152. A bill for the relief of Elio R. Anelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 13153. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William H. Chinn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 13154. A bill for the relief of Mariantonia Bavaro and Frank Bavaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 13155. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Pericle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 13156. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Chehebar, his wife, Marcelle Lavy Chehebar, and their minor children, Albert, Zakia, Zaki, Jacques, and Joseph Chehebar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 13157. A bill for the relief of Clementina Centellegher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 13158. A bill for the relief of Paul Vasos (Pavlos Veizis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 13159. A bill for the relief of Amsih Moussa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 13160. A bill for the relief of Woody W. Hackney of Fort Worth, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

536. Mr. PATMAN presented a resolution of Hopkins County Barracks No. 1645, Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Department of Texas, Sulphur Springs, Tex., Manning T. Gafford, commander, and John L. Carter, quartermaster-adjutant, going on record as supporting the principle that a Federal pension program should be provided for World War I veterans, their widows and orphans separate and apart from that provided for veterans and their widows and orphans of the United States later wars, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### National Police Hall of Fame

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a National Police Hall of Fame will be dedicated on October 15 at Port Charlotte, Fla., to the memory of all police officers in the United States who have given their lives in the line of duty to protect our citizens.

The hall of fame will consist of a beautiful modern building containing typical equipment used in police departments, as well as a memorial listing the names of all law enforcement officers who have been killed in the line of duty.

The memorial is being built by the National Police Officers Association of America and will be open to the public year round without charge. This non-profit association, the largest of its kind in the United States, has chosen Port Charlotte as its retirement city. Floridians are happy to have these dedicated public servants come to Florida, and take pride in the National Police Hall of Fame being located in our State.

The law enforcement officer is one of the most important, yet often neglected member of our community. He strives to give us and our families the protection that we need and expect. Personal sacrifice is often the result of the police officer's devotion to duty—too often this sacrifice is his own life. Forty-eight officers lost their lives in 1959 while giving us that protection we frequently take for granted.

The National Police Hall of Fame has been designed to commemorate these sacrifices in the war against crime. It will be maintained by the National Police Officers Association of America membership, but will be dedicated to all law